DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 296 CG 031 720

TITLE	Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. House of Representatives, One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session (Washington, DC, March 25, 1999).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Committee on Education and the Workforce.
REPORT NO	House-Hrg-106-15
ISBN	ISBN-0-16-058684-4
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	76p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Children; *Crime Prevention; Delinquency; *Delinquency Prevention; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Government Role; Hearings; Homeless People; *Prevention; Program Descriptions; Runaways; Violence; *Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 106th; *Juvenile Crime; *Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act 1974

ABSTRACT

This hearing on the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act (H.R. 1150) presents testimonies from individuals who administer the key federal programs that address problems of juvenile delinquency and runaway and homeless youth. As the committee looks toward reauthorizing the Juvenile Justice Act, it is suggested that the act needs a stronger emphasis on its protection and prevention focuses, as presented in H.R. 1150. Testimony is presented by Shay Bilchik, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Patricia Montoya, Commissioner of the Administrator on Children, Youth, and Families. An appendix contains the prepared statements of the witnesses. (GCP)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 296

Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. House of Representatives, One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session (Washington, DC, March 25, 1999).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ❑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ❑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CG 031 720

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG

JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 25, 1999

Serial No. 106–15

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

57–759 WASHINGTON : 1999

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-058684-4

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
BILL E. BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware
SAM JOHNSON, Texas
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri
JAMES C. GREENWOOD, Pennsylvania
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
DAVID M. McINTOSH, Indiana
CHARLIE W. NORWOOD, JR., Georgia
RON PAUL, Texas
BOB SCHAFFER, Colorado
FRED UPTON, Michigan
NATHAN DEAL, Georgia
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
MATT SALMON, Arizona
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado
ERNIE FLETCHER, Kentucky
JIM DeMINT, South Carolina
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
PATSY MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Virginia
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto-Rico
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
RUBEN HINOJOSA, Texas
CAROLYN McCARTHY, New York
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
RON KIND, Wisconsin
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
DENNIS KUCINICH, Ohio
DAVID WU, Oregon
RUSH D. HOLT, New Jersey

Kevin Talley, *Staff Director*
Gail E. Weiss, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware, *Chairman*

SAM JOHNSON, Texas
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
RON PAUL, Texas
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES C. GREENWOOD, Pennsylvania
DAVID M. McINTOSH, Indiana
FRED UPTON, Michigan
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
BOB SCHAFFER, Colorado
MATT SALMON, Arizona
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado
JIM DeMINT, South Carolina

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
GEORGE MILLER, California
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
PATSY MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Virginia
DENNIS KUCINICH, Ohio
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto-Rico
CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
RUBEN HINOJOSA, Texas
CAROLYN McCARTHY, New York
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
DAVID WU, Oregon

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HEARING ON JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT
Thursday, March 25, 1999
House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Early Childhood Development,
Committee on Education and the Workforce,
Washington, D.C.

Table of Contents

The Statement Of Shay Bilchik, Administrator, Office Of Juvenile Justice And Delinquency Prevention, United States Department Of Justice..... 5

The Statement Of Patricia Montoya, Commissioner Of The Administrator On Children, Youth, And Families, U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services.....7

Appendix A- The Written Statement Of Shay Bilchik, Administrator, Office Of Juvenile Justice And Delinquency Prevention, United States Department Of Justice.....37

Appendix B- The Written Statement Of Patricia Montoya, Commissioner Of The Administrator On Children, Youth, And Families, U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services.....59

Table of Indexes.....74

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:50 p.m., in Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Mike Castle [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Castle, DeMint, Greenwood, Petri, Roukema, Schaffer, Souder, Ford, Hinojosa, Kildee, Kucinich, Martinez, McCarthy, Scott, Woolsey, and Wu.

Staff present: Robert Borden, Professional Staff Member; Castleman, Office Manager; Jay Diskey, Communications Director; Victor Klatt, Education Policy Coordinator; Bill McCarthy, Press Secretary; Krisanne Pearce, Professional Staff Member; Reynard, Media Assistant; Lynn Selmser, Professional Staff Member; Bailey Wood, Legislative Assistant; Roxanna Folescy, Staff Assistant; Dr. June L. Harris, Education Coordinator; Cheryl Johnson, Legislative Associate, and Alex Nock, Legislative Associate.

Chairman Castle. [presiding] The committee will come to order.

Let me personally apologize to the witnesses and anybody else who is here for my tardiness. I, along with Mr. Kildee, and maybe others here, were in attendance at the speech that Bishop Tutu was giving, and since I was not more than 10 feet from him, I did not think it was appropriate to leave. Besides, I did not want to leave.

[Laughter.]

It was a very enjoyable speech, but I did not mean to be late for this. It just went a little longer than we had expected. We are better for it, at least.

I would like to welcome everybody here to today's hearing on The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This will be the second and final hearing on this Act prior to the committee markup.

Last Congress, we had a strong bipartisan bill, H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control Delinquency Prevention Act. We are currently working to develop the same bipartisan support for H.R. 1150, introduced by Congressman Jim Greenwood on March 17.

Each year, far too many young people enter the juvenile justice system. If we do not make an effort to work with these children now and provide them with the support they need to turn their lives around, we will be supporting them financially when they enter the adult prison system years from now. While there are some children, those committing the most violent acts, which we cannot help, I believe that most children will respond favorably to appropriate interventions.

Today, we will hear from those individuals who administer the key Federal programs that address problems of juvenile delinquency and runaway and homeless youths. I would be very interested to learn of their activities in this area and how we can all work together to give each and every child an opportunity to become a productive

citizen.

Let me turn to Mr. Kildee for any opening statement he wishes to make.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to join you and my colleagues in welcoming Shay Bilchik and Patricia Montoya before the committee today. The service which both of you have provided to this administration and to the children of our country has been very, very valuable. I know that Chairman Castle and I are looking forward to your testimony.

I would like, also, to rise to a point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, and recognize a dear friend, and probably my first great expert and resource person in this area, Mary Ann Mattingly. [Refers to Ms. Mattingly] When I first came down here, I think 23 years ago, she became one of my real mentors, and I appreciate your presence here today.

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, since its enactment in 1974, has been a vital component of our Nation's efforts to combat juvenile delinquency. And, key to this effort to combat delinquency has been a two-prong focus aimed at both prevention of juvenile delinquency and protecting juveniles who, unfortunately, encounter the justice system. This two-prong focus has been a vital blueprint for our local communities to combat juvenile delinquency and invest in their youth.

As we look to re-authorize the Juvenile Justice Act, I believe we need to strengthen its prevention and protection focuses. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 1150, as introduced by Congressman Greenwood and Chairman Castle, is an excellent starting place in our efforts to strengthen these focuses.

Again, I want to thank the witnesses for appearing today, and I look forward to your testimony.

Chairman Castle. Thank you very much, Mr. Kildee. It is our practice here just to have the opening statements by the subcommittee Chair and the ranking member. With that, we will go to the introduction and your testimony.

Mr. Shay Bilchik will be our first witness. He is the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP, in the United States Department of Justice. Prior to his tenure at OJJDP, Mr. Bilchik worked in the Department of Justice as an Associate Deputy Attorney General.

At the Department of Justice, he had supervisory authority over juvenile prosecution programs, established a child advocacy center, which is a multi-disciplinary intake unit for cases involving victims of child abuse, and served on a number of multi-disciplinary task forces.

Prior to service in the Attorney General's office, Mr. Bilchik served as Assistant State Attorney for the 11th Judicial Circuit of Florida in Miami.

As the Administrator of OJJDP, Mr. Bilchik has focused the priorities of the office on developing policies that support a comprehensive approach toward reducing juvenile offenses and victimization.

Our other witness here today on the same panel, is Mrs. Patricia Montoya. Mrs. Montoya serves as the Commissioner of the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services. As Commissioner, she oversees the implementation of Federal programs that assist vulnerable children and youth.

Prior to her current position, she was a Regional Director of Region 6 for the Department of Health and Human Services. Her wide-ranging responsibilities included implementation oversight, public speaking on Medicaid managed care, the children's health insurance program, teen pregnancy, welfare reform, child care, safe houses for youth, and community development_quite a spread.

Before joining the administration, Mrs. Montoya was practice manager for Presbyterian Family Healthcare, a hospital-based primary and urgent care center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. From 1989-1993, she served as the executive director of New Mexico Health Resources, also in Albuquerque. For two years, she served as assistant director for the American Nurses Association.

We are delighted to have you both with us. Mr. Bilchik, if you are ready to make your opening statement, we will start with you.

STATEMENT OF SHAY BILCHIK, ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. Bilchik. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity today to discuss the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's perspective on legislative approaches to address the prevention and control of violent and serious juvenile crime.

It is important to note, I think, at the very beginning of my testimony, that the context for this testimony is very different than in past years. For in those years, we had either been experiencing large increases in violent juvenile crime or were just beginning to see a decrease.

I am pleased, therefore, to report to you that the juvenile arrest for part one violent crimes has now dropped for three straight years, falling 23 percent from 1994 to 1997. This positive trend is due, in part, to a movement for the balanced approach to juvenile crime, one that combines prevention programs for at-risk youths with early intervention and sanctions and strong law enforcement efforts that hold offenders accountable at every stage of the juvenile justice system.

In my written statement, I have outlined many of the programs undertaken by OJJDP, in partnership with States, communities, and tribal governments, to implement this balanced approach to juvenile crime. I recommend that you review those programs, but, most importantly, that when you have time, that you visit those programs. It is the

most meaningful opportunity to understand how this balanced approach is taking hold in communities across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn to consideration of legislative initiatives that will affect how the Federal Government continues to support State and local efforts to drive down violent juvenile crime.

We are at critical point in our efforts to address the problems of juvenile crime. Too often we turn away from a problem after initial signs of success and move on the next issue that has risen to a crisis proportion. We cannot let that happen in this instance. Instead, we must build on the good work that has been done to date, continue to build our knowledge about what works, and sustain our support for the balanced approach communities have adopted in attacking juvenile crime.

In 1997, the administration sent its Anti-Gang and Youth Violence Act to Congress. Although that bill was not actively considered, some elements were integrated into H.R. 1818, which was passed by the House and is now reflected, in large measure, in H.R. 1150, the bill Mr. Greenwood and others introduced last week.

H.R. 1818 would have provided OJJDP with the tools necessary to assist State and local governments to address juvenile violence and delinquency. For that reason, I praise the direction that this committee is taking. You have chartered the course which will help to sustain those local and State efforts I just spoke about. There are, however, several areas of legislation that we would like to see addressed as this committee addresses H.R. 1150.

As modeled by the very successful Title 5, Community Prevention Grant Programs, it is my belief that any new block grant program should provide for direct State awards to units of local governments, which would, in turn, contract with eligible service providers to carry out local prevention and early intervention programs.

As a result of this current structure under the Community Prevention Grants Program, we have now seen more than 600 awards made to local communities that have worked through local policy prevention boards to establish comprehensive plans for the prevention of delinquency, and, with Federal support in that program, have filled in some of the gaps in services they have determined to be most critical for their individual communities.

This approach has resulted in added investment at the local level. It has far exceeded the local match of 50 percent required under this program_a sign, I believe, of the buy-in that is created when local units of government are also involved in the grant process.

The House bill's proposed formula grants program maintains the four statutory core requirements that provide basic protections for juveniles in the juvenile justice system. We believe that the flexibility and its provisions related to de-institutionalization of status offenders, separation of juveniles from adults, and jail and lock-up removal requirements is appropriate. However, the disproportion of minority confinement plan requirements should not be limited to prevention and system improvement efforts designed to reduce the number of minority juveniles who ``come into contact" with the

juvenile justice system.

Instead, it should address the over-representation that results from factors and circumstances that take place both prior to the juvenile entry into the system and those that occur after the juvenile has entered the system. The research that has been compiled to date in this area clearly supports this position.

As you are aware, the core requirements represent minimum protections for juveniles in the juvenile justice system. We believe that tying eligibility for funds to compliance with these requirements is an important incentive for State and local governments to operate their juvenile justice systems in a manner that keeps children safe from physical and psychological harm. While we agree with the House bill that some portion of the formula grants allocation should be available to a State, regardless of its compliance with the core requirements, we believe that non-compliance with any one or more of these core requirements should result in a loss of eligibility or 50 percent of the total allocation to a State rather than 12.5 percent for each individual core requirement violated.

Mr. Chairman, as I visit communities and listen to policymakers and practitioners about the kind of Federal support that is needed for them to sustain their efforts, I hear two main themes: the need for balanced funding for local and State programs, and strong Federal support for these efforts through research, demonstration of promising approaches, evaluation, training, technical assistance, and information_information, the kind of which that non-researchers can understand, as well as researchers, about what works and doesn't work to prevent and control delinquency and reduce juvenile victimization. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that it is critical to maintain a strong Federal role in all of these areas of activity.

I look forward to working with you and the subcommittee to formulate legislation that will provide the statutory framework to continue the significant and substantial progress that State and local governments have made, with Federal support, in addressing the prevention and control of delinquency and the improvement of the juvenile justice system.

Thank you.

See Appendix A For The Statement Of Shay Bilchik, Administrator, Office Of Juvenile Justice And Delinquency Prevention, United States Department Of Justice.

Chairman Castle. Thank you very much, Mr. Bilchik. We look forward to having a dialogue with you in a couple of minutes.

We will go to Mrs. Montoya now.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA MONTOYA, COMMISSIONER OF THE ADMINISTRATOR ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND

FAMILIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

Ms. Montoya. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the importance of programs serving youth and to express the administration's strong support for re-authorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. I would particularly like to thank Chairman Castle, Mr. Greenwood, and other members of the subcommittee, for the leadership you have provided on this very important issue.

Time ran out before a final bill could be enacted during the last Congress, but I am hopeful that this year, marking the 25th anniversary of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program, we will be able to continue a tradition of bipartisan support and enact final re-authorizing legislation.

It is estimated that between 500,000 and 1,500,000 children and youth run away from home each year. A 1988 study estimated that over 127,000 children were throwaways_children who had been told to leave the house, had been abandoned, or prevented from returning home. Many youths are leaving homes because they have been affected by abuse, neglect, substance abuse, mental illness, or other family problems.

The programs and support systems authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act serve as a critical life line to these youths and their families. They provide a safe place to turn in times of crisis, and they offer the services, training, skills, and, most importantly, the positive support youth need to help make the transition to healthy, productive lives as adults. I would like to share a story that illustrates the importance of youth programs.

A young woman ran away from home at the age of 14 due to physical and sexual abuse. She found her way to the Central Texas Youth Services Bureau Shelter for Runaway Youths. Six years later, this young woman appeared at the shelter director's office and reported she had just graduated from nursing school and was getting married. She said she owed her life to the agency. If it had not been for their shelter and the caring staff, she probably would be dead.

Recognizing the importance of our youth programs, the President's budget proposes a 33 percent increase in funding for the transition living program. This proposal, along with several initiatives to expand supports to youths aging out of the foster care system, is part of our overall effort to assist vulnerable youth in making a successful passage to adulthood.

Assuring swift re-authorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act is yet another step in fulfilling our commitment to youth. To help meet the needs of these very vulnerable youths, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes three grant programs. In my written statement, I have provided a more in-depth description these programs.

The Basic Center Program, which provides temporary emergency shelter to runaway and homeless youth, while working to reunite with their families, when possible; the Transitional Living Programs, which provides longer-term residential,

educational, and vocational services to homeless youth, to enable them to develop the skills they need to become self-sufficient as young adults; and, the Street Outreach Program, which reaches out to young people on the streets, to protect them from sexual abuse or exploitation, and, to help connect them to the needed services and community supports. In Fiscal Year 1998, these three programs together served about 75,000 youth.

In addition to the three grant programs, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes funds for a number of support activities, such as the National Runaway Switchboard. The Switchboard is a national communication system that assists runaway youths and their families by linking them to crisis counseling, programs and resources, and each other, as appropriate.

The Switchboard typically responds to more 12,500 calls a month. The program also support the National Clearinghouse on Families and Youths, the Regional Training and Technical Assistance Network, and support for much needed data collection, evaluation, research, and demonstration activities.

These activities and the programs authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act assure that, for some of the youth, most at-risk, those who have runaway or have been pushed out of their homes, there will be a safe place to go, with a caring adult.

In closing, we look forward to working with you to enact bipartisan legislation to re-authorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, so that we may insure that these programs continue to help youths, across the country, grow and flourish.

I would be pleased answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

See Appendix B For The Written Statement Of Patricia Montoya, Commissioner Of The Administrator On Children, Youth, And Families, U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services.

Chairman Castle. Thank you very much, Mrs. Montoya. Thank you both.

We will now turn to questions. I am going to defer my turn, in order to allow the primary sponsor of the legislation to be able to go first. With that, we will go on to Congressman Greenwood.

Mr. Greenwood. Thank you for that, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon.

The day we introduced the bill, we had a press conference, and we had two young people who had been through the system who we brought here as success stories. A young man who actually had been involved in the murder of his uncle, who has been through the process, more or less rescued from the adult system, where he could have

wound up, and is now a successful college student. A young lady who had been very badly abused and began to commit some crimes, and is now a teacher.

We know much of the programs that are funded by this Federal legislation produced success stories. Mr. Bilchik, what criteria do you use and how do you evaluate programs in terms of their success? If a community turned to you and said, ''We have these problems with juvenile delinquency in our community; tell us what has worked best in this country?', how would you answer that question? I do not mean specifically, but, I mean, what data would you turn to?

Mr. Bilchik. It is interesting, Mr. Greenwood, because I think I have heard that question probably 1,000 times since I have been Administrator. So, it is absolutely the right question.

My answer, first would be_

Mr. Greenwood. The question I asked or the question I am hearing from communities_

Mr. Bilchik. Okay.

Mr. Greenwood. What do we need to do to solve the problems that we are seeing in our communities? How do we learn about what works? And, how do we implement it?

Mr. Bilchik. One of the first things that the conversation involves is, how are you assessing what you need to do? How are you analyzing the data in your local community about the problems that you are seeing? What are the indicators that you are looking for in judging how to attack juvenile crime or the victimization of kids in your community?

There is a lot of good work being done on that level. We are able to help them with additional assistance to do that kind of function.

Once they have identified a problem, what we have done for the last five years is to look for and find effective programs, programs that work.

I brought with me a booklet that is a project that we are involved with called, ''The Blueprint Project.'' These are 10 model programs that have been identified by researchers as being effective in attacking certain types of problems that communities are facing, whether it be not having positive adult role models for children in the community, therefore, mentoring program; high levels of abuse and neglect in the community, nurse home-visiting, as a remedy.

Mr. Greenwood. If I may, the researchers who identified those 10 programs, did they use quantifiable measurements in terms of recidivism and all of those kinds of indicators?

Mr. Bilchik. They looked; they had very rigorous evaluation design set up with control experimental designs to look at what the impact of the program was. So, for example, one of the more popular programs that people talk about now is the Mentoring Program through Big Brothers, Big Sisters, done again with that kind of experimental design. Seeing the kids who experience the mentoring relationship had wonderful outcomes, reduced drug abuse, alcohol abuse, better school performance, less aggressive behavior_whereas, the children who did not have that positive influence in their lives through that program did not have that kind of positive outcome.

So, we are trying to identify programs across the board that have that rigorous evaluation, but, also, to be honest with you, to identify programs that we think are promising, that reflect underlying principles that we know to be effective, and then get that information out to the communities. Not just in a large volume and say, ``Here it is; good luck," but make sure they know there is support behind it.

So, when I learned about this program, it was not just to say, we will pass out 10,000 of these. It was to say, we will support the technical assistance you want to now implement these programs. We will send the people to your community to help you implement these programs.

That is what we are doing right now with this program and others. So, we are there to help them and with the most scientific of evidence, or, if you want to step down a level, promising approaches, as well, that they want to implement in their communities.

Mr. Greenwood. Let me see if I can squeeze in a quick question for you, Mrs. Montoya.

You spoke of the Federal funds that you receive helping you leverage non-Federal dollars on a 2-to-1 ration. What other groups do your programs typically partner with?

Ms. Montoya. Many of the other programs that we partner with are, not only are Federal partners, but we now have nine demonstration programs out with the States where we are involving the States coming together to work on some promising youth development strategies within their States.

We are also, many of our local grantees have just been superior at pulling together partnerships within the local community, working both with the school systems, working with the juvenile justice system at their local community, working with a lot of the non-profits and service organizations, as Mr. Bilchik had mentioned. We find that all of these coming together are what we are seeing really make a difference at the local community level.

Mr. Greenwood. Thank you. Thank you , Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Greenwood. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The President and his 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program have proposed that we increase this spending from $200 million to $600 million. Are there ways in which your two respective agencies can tie into that after-school program to make both of your programs more effective?

We will start with you.

Mr. Bilchik. The level of cooperation that has existed between different departments within the Federal Government has been, I think, unprecedented. So, the immediate answer is yes.

As soon as that were to become a reality, we would have that kind of sit-down conversation. How do we link that kind of after-school activity, that kind of support activity for schools, with the kind of prevention programs that we are involved in at OJJDP, or perhaps, might going beyond the Center for Mental Health Services, or other Federal agencies?

Mr. Kildee, I do not want to stray too far from that particular program, but I want to give an example of that.

That is the recent appropriation received by four different Federal agencies: OJJDP receiving a $15 million appropriation for school violence reduction; The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Agency, within the Department of Education, receiving a $60 million appropriation; the Center for Mental Health Services, a $25 million allocation, and our COPS Office, over $60 million. We are pulling those funds together so the communities can make one central application to receive support from all four of our agencies. We all represent different kinds of activities, but all relate to the same type of goal, reducing school violence. And, those communities will have the ease of knowing that with one application, they could potentially access what in the past would require four applications with four separate monitoring processes and program implementation processes.

We are cutting through a lot of that. I think, if I understand what you are looking for, there is that level of cooperation across the agencies to build on a core program like the one you mentioned.

Mr. Kildee. Mrs. Montoya.

Ms. Montoya. Congressman, when the dollars first went out, we started working with the Department of Education to really see what we could do to collaborate with them because, as you well know, within our department, and, within ACYF, of course, we have the program experience of working with children and families, and so we brought that piece to the table to see what we could do in helping to build what they were already doing with their after-school programs. In particular, in the youth arena, through our Youth Services Bureau, we have done a lot of work, have established a lot of networks out there, and we are looking to see how we might work with them to build on where they are going and how we might amesh those programs to better serve, to improve

access, and to meet those needs out in the communities.

Mr. Kildee. Is there a formalized interagency network between, say, the Department of Justice, your agency, within the Department of Justice, and your agency within HHS and the Department of Education, because we are dealing with many of the same kids? Is there a formalized interagency method or structure?

Mr. Bilchik. There is one that is done; there may be others, but there is one done through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the JJDP Act. That is the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. It is something that we think is a wise investment of $200,000 a year. It facilitates quarterly meetings of the Federal agencies and nine practitioner members from the field, all over the country, that give input as to the most critical things that we should be doing at the Federal Government to coordinate our efforts and provide services at the State and local level.

That project has resulted in numerous joint undertakings between our Federal agencies with that practitioner input, including the introduction of a national juvenile justice action plan to reduce violent offending.

Ms. Montoya. There is not a formal memorandum of understanding through which we operate on, but we do meet regularly with all of the other Federal departments with members of each other's interagency task forces and working groups on many of these subject areas. That is how we have been operating.

Mr. Kildee. I could see the same young person being touched by your two agencies, plus the Department of Education and the 21st Century Programs.

Interesting, the transitional living which you provide, several years ago we had a witness here, a young man who shared your last name, Mrs. Montoya, no relation to you, from my district. He had had some serious problems. The transitional living is probably the thing that really clicked him back into place and it is very important_I visited some of the transitional places in my district_but I run into this young gentleman now, who is probably about 27, 28. Mary Ann met him. We were there when he testified that day. What a success story. I mean, he is married now with two children, a very responsible father. Without this program, we could only imagine what may have happened. You are involved in something very, very important, and I really appreciate it very much. Thank you.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Kildee.

We will next go to Mr. Schaffer, who is also the vice-chairman of this committee.

Mr. Schaffer. Actually, I have a number of questions for Mr. Bilchik.

With respect to the structure and authorization of the legislation that is before us in the programs that you administer through it, I am curious about the federalism relationship between States and the Federal Government. I guess I just want to ask some general questions in that direction because, it would seem to me, that most States are concerned about reducing juvenile crime and also reducing delinquency within their own States, and that is perhaps where the greatest motivation exists, not to mention in school districts and among school board members and throughout the local structure. I guess my question is: Have you run across, in all the research and time and effort that you have spent, studying and analyzing what works and what does not work in States, have you run across any State at all that seems unconcerned about juvenile crime and lacks a desire to see it reduced?

Mr. Bilchik. No, I do not think I have.

Mr. Schaffer. Do you know of any State that is simply incapable, in your estimation, of reducing juvenile crime and reducing delinquency if the Federal Government perhaps played no role at all?

Mr. Bilchik. I think I have heard from virtually every State that they are looking for additional support; that they do not feel they have the level of support in-house, so to speak, without a Federal partner to help them seed new programs, learn about effective practices in other States. They almost look at using the Federal Government as a funnel, where all the information can come from the different States and different communities, about what is effective, and, then spread back out to them in a way that they could not ascertain individually.

Mr. Schaffer. So, just to be clear, you have heard from States who believe that they would be incapable of reducing juvenile crime and delinquency, were it not for the Federal Government?

Mr. Bilchik. I do not think I would put it that way, but I think they are looking for assistance. I think if we were not there to help them somehow, they would take it on themselves and get it done.

Mr. Schaffer. Without the Federal Government, do you think there are some States that would do a poorer job of reducing juvenile crime and reducing delinquency?

Mr. Bilchik. Yes, I think we provide a valuable role that cannot be replaced in terms of our ability to gather information from around the country and get it back to them.

Mr. Schaffer. Moving down on opinion, have you heard from States that have expressed that to you and to the Department? Are they specific States, for example, that you can

point to that have led you to that conclusion?

Mr. Bilchik. I have not had that kind of conversation about, ``What would you do without us? How would you deal with it on your own?'' It is more than construct of_we really value the kind of support you can give us with the information on effective practices and the technical assistance.

Mr. Schaffer. Do you know of any governors or any State leaders who have identified funding for your program as the highest priority in the grand scheme of education funding?

Mr. Bilchik. I have not had that conversation.

Mr. Schaffer. I ask these questions because our direction in Congress over the last couple of years has been to try to decentralize as much authority back to States as we possibly can. Realizing that States have legitimate motives and capable and confident legislators, governors, and so on, who want to move in the same direction that we want to see them move in and believe we are helping here, and in moving that authority out of Washington and back to the States, we are really focusing on giving governors and legislators the maximum amount of flexibility to address the needs that they believe to be the highest priorities for them.

So, with that in mind, I would like to ask, why shouldn't we just give the cash to States directly and let them prioritize those funds however they want, rather than give the money to you and your Department and agency?

Mr. Bilchik. In actuality, I would say about 80 percent of the funding that we receive does funnel directly to the States and local communities for them through assessment processes at those levels to determine the best way to spend it.

Mr. Schaffer. I guess the question is, why shouldn't we have just one funnel, for example, where the Congress gives the cash to States, in block grant fashion? They could spend it on juvenile delinquency prevention, they could perhaps spend it on increasing the number of teachers, even spend it on decreasing class size.

Mr. Bilchik. I think there is a side question there, and that is, is there a need for a balance? Should the Federal Government take the position that, in using these funds, we should ensure that there is a balanced approach in taking on the problem, which we have seen is effective in reducing juvenile crime. I think that is one response in terms of why you would want to see it funnel through, so there could be that accountability activity, as well as the prevention activity, ensured with these Federal funds.

Mr. Schaffer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Schaffer. Mr. Scott.

Mr. Scott. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bilchik, is there great flexibility on how the States can use the money?

Mr. Bilchik. There is great flexibility within wide program areas for them to decide, within the formula program, within a range of prevention activities, through our current operations.

Mr. Scott. And those decisions are made at the local and State level?

Mr. Bilchik. With input from a wide range of practitioners at the local and State level.

Mr. Scott. I noticed in your testimony that you support the core requirements pretty much as they are.

Mr. Bilchik. Yes.

Mr. Scott. Part of one of the core requirements requires a separation of children, separation from adults. Is there any research that shows that it makes sense to separate juveniles from adults?

Mr. Bilchik. We have learned history, Mr. Scott, as you know, that when we do not create that separation, we create horrible outcomes for those kids. Increased suicide rates are the primary things we saw back in the 1970's, when these provisions began to be adopted. We do not need to revisit that. We know the outcomes of mixing juveniles with adult offenders. We need to keep them separate. I think the suicide rate was almost six-fold in instances where they were not kept separate.

Mr. Scott. Is there research that shows that the crime rate goes up when you put juveniles with adults?

Mr. Bilchik. I am not familiar with the particular research about the crime rate going up. I know that there is research around the negative influences of adult offenders on juveniles in that incarcerative environment. But, I am not familiar with the crime rate

data.

Mr. Scott. Increased recidivism?

Mr. Bilchik. Yes, Mr. Scott.

Mr. Scott. Yes, there is increased recidivism?

Mr. Bilchik. Right, that would be one negative outcome.

Mr. Scott. Okay. On your DMC you indicated a desire to have more things considered than just contact with the juvenile system. Obviously, poverty and there are other factors that could create a disproportionate minority confinement. Do you need a change in statutory language or change in regulations to encourage people to look more broadly at DMC?

Mr. Bilchik. The current law, as it exists now, is satisfactory to address the complete range of activities in relation to disproportionate minority confinement. Both prevention activities, community-based programming, as well as a programming that would impact the way minorities enter, and then penetrate into the juvenile justice system at a much higher rate than their population.

Mr. Scott. You indicated graduated sanctions were also needed. As you know, JJDP is re-authorized in two different committees, Education and the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee held a hearing recently where many of the judges testified a frustration about the fact that they have essentially two alternatives, probation and incarceration, and could be very well served by intermediate sanctions. Could you say a little bit about what kind of graduated sanctions you would be talking about?

Mr. Bilchik. I have heard this before, Mr. Scott, as well, from different community members who come to us looking for assistance on types of programs they could implement, besides just putting a child on probation, the kind of community-based programs that you could see, academic support programs, mentoring programs, after-school activities that include: vocational training, non-residential programs like that, but, also, residential community-based programs. We think a lot about incarceration or punishment in an institution, but we know that local community-based residential programs are usually more successful than those large institutions that we think about at the extreme end of the system. Those are the kinds of programs we have identified in a comprehensive approach that we have documented in this book.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Scott. When you say, ``graduated sanctions,'' you are including in that services to the juvenile.

Mr. Bilchik. I think that is why it is a misnomer. When you talk about graduated sanctions, you are talking excluding levels of accountability, but, also, treatment. You have got to do both through the system. And, that's what that is about.

Mr. Scott. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Scott. Mrs. Roukema.

Mrs. Roukema. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly appreciate your testimony here today, although I only heard part of it. I will get back to Mr. Bilchik because I had to be on the phone, and I will get back to him.

But, first, Ms. Montoya, I do want to say that the transitional living program, I think as you have outlined, is very impressive and it is certainly one that I think we should be enhancing. I do not know whether or not you could single out one or two ways that we should be enhancing it in this legislation or whether it is simply up to the funding level. So, if you would answer that?

But, I also want to know_maybe I missed it, and I should know this_under that program, are custodial parents permitted and possible adoption, like, under the Division of Youth and Family Services that we have? Is that part of the program, a component of the program, or should it be? If it isn't, should it be? I would think it should be.

Ms. Montoya. Congresswoman, first of all, let me address your first question regarding the transitional living program. At this point in time, the recommendation is for an increase in the appropriation. There is a lot flexibility with that program, and that is really what is essential in order to make it most successful. We attribute a lot of that to its success. But, what we now have with that program is that we are only now serving 78 cities and 40 States, and so, with the increased appropriation, we are looking to be able to serve at least an additional 600 youth and to add at least 20 new programs in those areas that are underserved.

Mrs. Roukema. But we are making progress, and its progress that you see has great benefits to juveniles?

Ms. Montoya. Yes. I mean, what we see is that we are assisting these young people to transition to adulthood. We are actually providing them with the keys to that successful transition, and so we see it as being extremely successful, and that is why the

administration is going for the expansion.

Your second question, I believe, would refer to the transitional living program, which is under our Runaway and Homeless Youth, and then we have our independent-living program, which is in our Children's Bureau, and our independent-living is also part of the administration's proposal to be increased and that is the one that works with foster care and adoptive families.

Mrs. Roukema. But, that is not included as part of this block grant?

Ms. Monteya. That is not part of this one, right.

Mrs. Roukema. That was my understanding, but I wanted to have a clarification of it. Thank you.

Now, with respect to the prevention block grant, Mr. Bilchik, I do not know whether or not you covered this, but I have a special interest in bootcamps. I do not know what the facts are, but I am absolutely convinced that they are beneficial. It is unfortunate, I guess, that we have not, although we have it on the books, we have not funded them. And, so, we have failed on our part, but can you tell me objectively_I do not know if it was part of your introductory statement_but, objectively, do you find them very worthwhile? Have they been proven worthwhile? And, I know that we have some in the State of New Jersey that seem to be very beneficial. How are they working out across the country?

Mr. Bilchik. Actually, there has been some Federal support for bootcamps for juveniles through the Corrections Program Office. And, you have seen both adult and juvenile bootcamps funded through them, for at least the construction of those programs.

We actually funded, as a demonstration program, three juvenile bootcamps several years ago. The results were mixed. We saw some increases in educational performance. We did not see real positive outcomes in that limited demonstration program in terms of recidivism.

But, as I said in my opening comments, you want to learn about what works and you want to learn about what does not work. We documented the things that we saw as weaknesses, instability of staff, training of staff, and lack of aftercare planning for re-entry into the community. So, we took that information and we have fed it into the Corrections Program Office, and they are, with the National Institute of Justice, now evaluating a wide range of juvenile and adult bootcamps to see their level of effectiveness.

And, the verdict is still out on whether the second generation of juvenile bootcamps will be more effective than the first. I think they have improved in every measure that I just mentioned, the training, the stability of staff, and the aftercare planning, as opposed to what we saw several years ago. So, I am hopeful.

Mrs. Roukema. When will that report be available?

Mr. Bilchik. I will have to check with the National Institute of Justice. My guess is it will not be for another year or two.

Mrs. Roukema. In the meantime, do you give your support to highlighting or including the bootcamps in the prevention block grant?

Mr. Bilchik. As an intervention program?

Mrs. Roukema. Yes.

Mr. Bilchik. Yes. And, also, but with a qualifier_that it is something that needs to be done with care, in terms of the elements that I mentioned. So, we are trying to provide the training through our experts on how do you support and enhance the aftercare component of a program.

But, yes, we think people should still explore them as more of a youth development model.

Mrs. Roukema. I am sorry you are not as enthusiastic about it as I am.

Mr. Bilchik. I am enthusiastic about the approach, if it is done with a youth development model, as opposed to a straight, militaristic model.

Mrs. Roukema. I see. All right, I am looking forward to the report. Thank you.

Mr. Scott. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Castle. Mr. Scott.

Mr. Scott. Would the gentlelady yield, appropriately?

Mrs. Roukema. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. Scott. Mr. Bilchik, has there been a difference in the outcome in whether or not they have an intensive education and counseling component, rather than the strict military?

Mr. Bilchik. Every one of the programs that we demonstrated has an education component. So, I can only speak to the evaluation of those three, and they showed positive outcomes in terms of education. Where they were weak was in planning for the re-entry for these back into the community. When you think about it, if you take a juvenile offender and put them in a program for a very short period of time, then do not provide the adequate social control and treatment support when they go back home, they end up associating with the same group of kids, the same issues and problems, and in a very short period of time, they will begin recidivating. We are looking for, not just that component, but the stronger aftercare component as well.

Mr. Scott. Thank you.

Chairman Castle. Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. Woolsey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to make a comment to my friend from New Jersey. I think you better be cautious; you are starting to sound like what Democrats are accused of_legislating from their heart and from their gut, instead of using good science.

Mrs. Roukema. Well, we Republicans have hearts and guts too.

Ms. Woolsey. I know you do.

[Laughter.]

Ms. Woolsey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to build on Mr. Scott's questions on flexibility. Last week, which seems like months ago already, we had our first hearing, and we had a young woman testify who was definitely a person rescued through the programs that you are speaking of. But, she was rescued because she was able to convince a program to waive a rule, to bend a rule. She was too old for the program by just a few months. They let her in anyway, and she is clean, sober, stable, and totally contributing to society and proud of it.

Now, my question to you is about the flexibility that judges have, that programs have, in order to make one size doesn't fit all. So, I'll start with you, Ms. Montoya. Talk about flexibility, and are we too rigid?

Ms. Montoya. Congresswoman, I believe that you are probably referring to the young woman that went through the transitional living program, who I think everyone heard last

week. What it is, is that we do have the guidelines, and that is our general way of being able to monitor and provide some uniformity to programs. However, there again is the possibility, through other dollars, these programs are not solely funded by us. They are receiving other dollars, and so if there is the potential that they might be able to serve the young person through some other sources, they would be able to have that flexibility. Under our particular program, they are limited in the amount of flexibility they are allowed to have as far as the age range that is covered under this rule. I believe it is actually part of the statute.

Ms. Woolsey. Would you agree with that? Do you think we should be that rigid? I mean, look at the success.

Ms. Montoya. I think, again, Congresswoman, it is one of those that we all know_there is always a time when flexibility is definitely the way to go, and we hope that we are able to make the right decision with these programs and with these individuals at the time. I would hope that, again, we are able to be as flexible as we can within the confines.

Mr. Bilchik. I think the flexibility in the JJDP Act is inherent in the way we are structured. We respect the State age limits for juveniles. In certain instances we have gone beyond that; for example, in gangs and gang activity, realizing that there is this transitionary period of youth where they may be involved in gangs_16, 17, 18, 19, where our age limit goes up into, past age 20. So, I think there is flexibility to reach out and work with youth, including the provision allowing first-aid statutes that extend jurisdiction beyond juvenile age frames into adulthood, when these individuals are still under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. So, I think we don't have many children who cannot receive our services as a result of those kinds of inflexible restrictions.

Ms. Woolsey. Well, Western States Youth Services Network is headquartered where I live in Petaluma, California. In responding to my question of what is important for us to be looking at here, they commented that graduated sanctions need to be broadened and redefined. In their experience_and they are a very successful program_they do believe we are being a little bit narrow and rigid. So, I would hope we would look at that in the future.

One more question, and that is about prevention. My fear is always that the prevention programs are apt to be slighted over intervention programs. Do you think it would be wise to have a guaranteed setaside for funds for prevention?

Mr. Bilchik. I think that when we look at the balance of a continuum of intervention and care for our kids, that we need to ensure that there is a guaranteed setaside or portion that will be for prevention. I think the prevention block grant in H.R. 1818 goes in that direction. It talks about funding those preventions, and very, very early intervention programs, as a separate program from the formula program. In that regard, I think it is to be commended.

Ms. Woolsey. All right, thank you. My time is up.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Ms. Woolsey, and we will go next to Mr. Tancredo.

Mr. Tancredo. Just one or two quick questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We're celebrating the 25th anniversary of this program, as I understand it. How much has been expended over that 25 years in this program?

Mr. Bilchik. I don't know off the top of my head; I'd have to check.

Mr. Tancredo. Any guess?

Mr. Bilchik. I'm trying to do quick math in my head here. I'll work on it while we keep talking.

Mr. Tancredo. Well, I only have one other question then. That is, has the number of instances of juvenile crime, as percentage of the population, risen or decreased over the last 25 years?

Mr. Bilchik. We are about the same level that we were in 1980. We are almost back down to that level in terms of crime rate_

Mr. Tancredo. So crime rates of gone down in the last_

Mr. Bilchik. It has gone up and then down, and then up and then down. It has gone up and down.

Mr. Tancredo. It has gone up and down. Have you done anything that would let us know what, in fact, caused the downward curve?

Mr. Bilchik. Well, one thing we know is that it is not related to population, because we're talking about rates. That is sometimes misleading when people look at this, and they say, well_

Mr. Tancredo. No, that's what I was asking. I asked as a percentage of the population.

Mr. Bilchik. Right. So, no one has done this kind of all-inclusive study to say that we controlled for every possible factor that you could control for, and we can tell you the reason we're seeing a downward trend in juvenile crime or adult crime is "X." We do know, when we look at individual components of these efforts, what is taking hold and what is being effective. We know which kinds of juvenile justice intervention programs are being effective, and what kind of prevention programs, and that we're seeing more of those, including those that go to the States and localities in this formula block grant fashion, and then are instituted with the knowledge of what is effective. We see that show up in the subgrants that go into local communities.

Mr. Tancredo. It just becomes very difficult to understand and recognize things. I am a freshman and new to the committee, but I am trying to figure out, especially during a re-authorization hearing, on what basis one would make a decision about the value of the program. If we would suggest that incidence of success, which we have heard, other members of the committee have identified anecdotally_of course, that is of no consequence in terms of whether or not this program works. One could assume that a lot of that would have happened, had this program never been there. So, it is very difficult, unless we can see that, because of the influx of dollars on one end of this pipeline, or funnel, as we keep putting it, that there is a commensurate reduction in the kind of activity that this is designed to deal with, on the other end_I just wonder if it is worth it, especially if we go through these rollercoaster examples of when instances of juvenile crime increase and decrease and we can't really identify what makes it happen.

We know some programs seem to work better than others, but, in the total scheme of things, one has to just really wonder if we would be any different today in this country if we had not spent the money in this particular program. You just have to wonder that.

Mr. Bilchik. I know it is not an easy question to answer. When you look at the way the funds have been spent over the years, particularly the last four or five years, and you start to see_for example, we have provided a mentoring program, a dedicated mentoring program, that has funded 93 programs as of last year. Now we are up to 160 through that dedicated mechanism, and through the formula program, over another 100 mentoring programs. We know mentoring programs have certain outcomes: reduced alcohol abuse, reduced drug abuse, less violent behavior by kids. Then you see corresponding decreases in communities of crime.

Mr. Greenwood. Would the gentleman from Colorado yield?

Mr. Tancredo. Yes.

Mr. Greenwood. I wonder, sir, if it might be helpful to answer the gentleman's question, if you could refer to the impact of the core requirements. For instance, prior to 25 years ago, there was not a core requirement that States separate children and adult offenders. So, therefore, the common practice was of having children in adult institutions being physically, sexually abused, being hardened as criminals. I assume there is a change we could talk about there. I would assume that there has been a change in the fact that, prior

to this act 25 years ago, status offenders were treated like criminal offenders, and kids who were running away from home because they were getting sexually abused and physically abused and mentally abused were having their parents having them locked up as if they were criminals, until they returned home so they could be re-abused. Aren't those measurable differences in the last 25 years?

Mr. Bilchik. Those are.

Mr. Tancredo. Well, I also wonder whether, reclaiming my time, I wonder whether or not we can, again, suggest that the only way in which those issues could have been dealt with was through this act, because, of course, we are not necessarily talking about prevention of juvenile crime here; we are talking about the_in these specific cases, anyway_issues that could be dealt with legislatively directly, not necessarily through a funding apparatus like this.

I was just looking at the report here, for instance, although I don't have this particular cite, but it identifies the number of programs and the outcomes. It says something, of course, that is almost self-evident, ``Unfortunately, there is clear evidence that the deterrent effects of most prevention programs deteriorate quickly once youth leave the program and return to their original neighborhoods, families, peer groups, or gangs.''

Well, again, pretty self-evident. So, it is difficult, then, again, for me to listen to someone cite a particular program as successful because it has changed this behavior. But, you say, yourself, that success is actually terminal_

Mr. Bilchik. Well, it is only terminal if it doesn't continue back into the community. That particular blueprint you are looking at is a perfect example of how you do transition kids within the community, setting to successful outcomes. It is the same thing we have in other programs, the multi-systemic therapies and other blueprint projects. It is community-based. It works with the family, with the school, peer groups influences, community influences, that have long-term four-year outcomes, not just short-term programmatic outcomes.

Mr. Tancredo. It seems to me, that being the case, we should be able to come in with very demonstrable evidence of success, and not something, I guess, that is a little more subjective in our analysis. It just seems that way.

Mr. Bilchik. I think the closest we have tried to come is to look at the programs that are implemented, try to ensure that they are as close to the effective programs that we have learned about, because we don't control, ultimately, what the local community will implement, but we do see they tend to follow this knowledge of best practices. The alternative really is to associate an evaluation with each and every program that is implemented at the local level, which really would be cost prohibitive.

Instead, the approach we have taken is to develop self-evaluation guidebooks, so communities can do these themselves, at very low cost, and measure their outcomes as they go along. And we just started that series in the last couple years. That might help answer that question down the road.

Mr. Tancredo. Thank you, sir. Also, were you able to come up with an amount?

Mr. Bilchik. Oh yes, I'm sorry, approximately 2 billion.

Mr. Tancredo. Two billion dollars?

Mr. Bilchik. Yes.

Mr. Tancredo. Thank you very much. No further questions.

Chairman Castle. Mr. Hinojosa.

Mr. Hinojosa. Thank you, Chairman Castle.

I want to direct my first question to Commissioner Pat Montoya. First, thank you for coming to be with us and to talk to us on the subject you are responsible for as Commissioner on Administration on Children, Youth, and Families. You support a continuum of support services to children from childhood to adolescence, to early adulthood.

Commissioner, would you recommend the largest allocation of financial resources at the earliest stage of childhood? If so, why?

Ms. Montoya. Well, Congressman, as you know, this administration has made great strides in investment in the early years, based upon much of the information we now have on early brain development, and those early years being so critical for the development of a person. So, we do have a large amount of investment in the early years. However, I think it is just as important that we look at protecting that investment, as we move through the continuum of development from those early years through the school years and on to pre-adolescence and adolescence. I don't think that we are in a position that we can actually say we need to put all of our resources in one area, because we need to provide that support for our children and youth as they transition through the different passages of life.

Mr. Hinojosa. I want to ask a specific question on the numbers of runaway children. I believe that the material I read said there was an estimated 1.5 million runaway children and youth. What percentage are males, and once you give me that number, how do you

process these male youth through the transitional living program?

Ms. Montoya. Congressman, we have seen a shift in the past. I believe, at this point in time, we are probably at about a 50-50 percent rate as far as the number of males and females. What we have seen is a change over the years of seeing more young females, actually, starting to runaway and be on the streets. And, what happens with our transitional living program, is that the young person will come in_these are then for the young people who cannot be reunited with their families. The basic center program is geared toward providing the temporary shelter and see about the possibility of family re-unification. When it is found that it will not be possible to reunite the child with the family, then they are brought into the transitional living program, where they are assessed. They receive both a mental health and a physical assessment to identify any physical and mental health needs they have.

At that time, they also set up a transitional plan for the young person to identify where they are at, and where they would like to be, so that they can start working on providing all the different supports that they will need to get there, whether it be completing their high school education, whether it is providing additional skills training for job placement, providing them with life skills and job development skills, so that they can transition to living independently.

One of the very basic things that we all take for granted in our day-to-day lives is our ability to manage our own lives, managing our money or checkbook, being able to rent, those types of daily activities. This is an area of focus that is worked on with these young people. So that, as they transition into that independent living, they have been provided those skills to be able to cope and to provide for themselves independently.

Mr. Hinojosa. Thank you, Commissioner, and that's all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Castle. Thank you. We'll go to Mr. Souder now.

Mr. Souder. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would first like to ask unanimous consent for the record of this hearing to be open until Thursday, April 15, for the receipt of additional information. That is one week longer than normal, because of the break. I have a number of written questions that will take a little bit longer time.

Chairman Castle. I don't believe there is any objection to that. We've spoken to Mr. Kildee about it. Without objection, so granted.

Mr. Souder. But, today I wanted to ask a series of questions related to the drug issue, because it clearly_I am sorry I missed your verbal testimony, but I read through your written testimony, which may be actually more complete than what you did verbally. But, it just screams off the pages. I mean, in Mr. Bilchik's statement you said that, while many of the crimes have gone down, it has gone up a 120 percent in drug use. In Ms.

Montoya's testimony it says 47 percent of youth reported a household member was abusing alcohol or drugs, for those who have been either been physically or sexually abused or neglected. That is, approximately half have substantiated_it is 125 percent in your studies. That would suggest that that should be a focus of what we are looking at. If other things are going down, and these are rising and are such high incidences, it would suggest that should be a priority here.

One question I have for Mr. Bilchik_ in your testimony, you state that OJJDB has funded the center where they have the ten programs related to drug prevention. Are those ten programs that they were following through, are those all drug prevention?

Mr. Bilchik. They're actually blueprints for violence prevention. A couple of them are also related directly to drug prevention programs: the life-skills training program and the Mid-west Prevention Project. Both target drug prevention.

Mr. Souder. Why would not a higher percentage be targeting drug prevention, if that is the fastest-growing category?

Mr. Bilchik. What this project has done_and it is a project we discovered out of Colorado_is to document programs that have had rigorous evaluations to them, and then replication, again, with rigorous evaluation. So, we now are working with them, actually, to determine other programs they can classify as blueprint projects, by helping them fund the secondary evaluations that are necessary to classify them as such. So, it is really a matter of what is out there, what has been evaluated by the Federal Government, as well as State and private, and then documenting those things. So, I agree with you. It would be nice to have additional ones, and we are working towards that.

Mr. Souder. Because one concern I have, which we will probably be addressing in our elementary and secondary schools act, is that, to some degree, as we go through the schools, we have kind of watered down or broadened the focus of the drug-free drug prevention programs; that even here, where we appropriated $5 million directly for drug prevention, you are saying two of the ten that they evaluated_

Mr. Bilchik. Let me explain. I will be clear. With the drug prevention program, the $5 million appropriation, those are only going to the models that deal with drug prevention.

Mr. Souder. The two?

Mr. Bilchik. Right. We are separately supporting the blueprint project with other funds.

Mr. Souder. That is helpful. Could you see that our office gets a copy of those two, as we look at the other drug programs that are working?

Mr. Bilchik. I'll provide those.

Mr. Souder. Because there is no question that we are on the edge. We see drug abuse going down in every other category, but going up among junior high and high-schoolers. The administration is talking about it; we are talking about prevention, and yet, we have very little factual data that shows us how to deal with this. Do you have any data on drug testing, for example, of kids on probation? I know at a school I was at last week, after talking to a group of seniors, the superintendent and the principal had interesting comments afterwards because many of the kids were saying, ''We need prevention-type programs." A number of them who were arguing for more testing had all previously had a problem. The superintendent and the principal were amazed that the people who were saying there needs to be a method of catching them_because a couple had gotten caught_they said it changed their lives and they got off the habit.

Also, often in probation cases, we see drug testing as a monitoring mechanism. Do you have any studies on that? Have you looked at that? Are you planning to do any studies related to drug testing and its effectiveness?

Mr. Bilchik. There have been studies done in relation to drug testing of juveniles entering the juvenile justice system, initially, to determine the percentage of the population that are drug-involved, and they are finding well over half have tested positive for drugs at the point of arrest. What we are doing at the present time is to try to work with probation, as these kids are ultimately going to leave those institutions. So when they re-enter communities, they are able to work with them on a regular testing regimen and making sure they refer them to treatment and follow-up with treatment. So, we developed a guidebook for probation officers to do that, but also now providing the training and technical assistance out in the field on actually how to implement it.

Mr. Souder. But as far as treatment and follow-up to treatment, do you know if you have any specific studies that show whether or not drug testing as part of that component, increases its effectiveness?

Mr. Bilchik. I don't have that, not at hand. I would be glad to follow up and provide you that information.

Mr. Souder. Yes, will you see if you have any such studies exist? And, if not, that is one of the things I would like to see pursued.

Mr. Bilchik. I know that it exists for adults. I just don't know if it exists for juveniles.

Mr. Souder. We heard at a hearing yesterday from an Arlington County, Texas sheriff, that 63 percent of all the people who are coming into their system, when they have tested them in their prison right now, have some form of drugs in their system. That is of all

prisoners, and not people who have stolen to fund a habit; this is at the time they are arrested, they have it in their system. This is such a spreading epidemic, that that ought to be a primary focus in looking at what works and what doesn't.

I would like to work with you in trying to look at what other methods of accountability we can look at, because we are not concerned so much about how a school gets there, or how a juvenile department gets there, but we are interested in seeing a reduction. I don't want it just to be kind of softer, things where we are out talking to people. We need to see what hard measurements and which programs are actually doing it, and I know drug testing is controversial, but it also seems to work in many areas.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Souder. Mr. Ford.

Mr. Ford. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief.

I was curious to know, from both of our panels_and I apologize for not being here through most of your testimony; I have read through some of the materials_but I am curious as it relates to some of the programs and the focus on families and communities, strengthening families and communities. I know we have seen voluminous materials come before us that talk about the importance of a nexus there. If you could just sort of talk about programs that are predicated on that theme and what we ought to be thinking about as we sort of move forward in this re-authorization as it relates to families and communities, and how we can strengthen those programs?

And, again, thank you for coming. Ruben Hinojosa has told me about you, Commissioner, and I how he has known you, and he speaks very highly of you. My colleague just left. So you have my respect and admiration as well, because of the respect that I have for him on these issues.

Ms. Montoya. Congressman, as you can see from the testimony, the programs, the runaway and homeless youth, of course, the basic shelter program is the one that is really geared towards looking at the possibility of family re-unification, when that is possible. Oftentimes, realizing that what has predicated the runaway has oftentimes been issues of miscommunication, just general family dynamics, and dealing with some of the family system issues that are going on_so the one thing that we see with that program is that it is an intervention piece to be able to really work with and intervene, and work with families, when there is that possibility; if it is the issue of substance abuse and drug abuse, and other issues, that we can get family counseling, and help them to work through to preserve their family unit.

But, I guess above and beyond that, and not a part of this re-authorization, but this administration, as you know, has put into their budget for the year 2000, $295 million that is really working on continuing to provide and promote safe and stable families. And so, again, it is the emphasis of providing those dollars out there to communities, and working with families through the different vehicles that exist to help promote and support that family system.

Mr. Bilchik. If I could build on that, in brief, one of the common denominators we have seen, when we look at effective programs, is a family component, and this really goes across the entire range of programs that are showing effectiveness. So, when it starts this early, the earliest prevention programs_the nurse home visiting programs for at-risk newborns born to teen moms, we know reduces child abuse and neglect; what we now know, through longitudinal studies 15 years later, will reduce delinquency by those infants now as adolescents by 50 percent. When we look at pre-school programs that are enhanced with family strengthening components, we can look at studies that have extended out 25 years, and know that there is a five-fold decrease in criminality by those babies who experience that kind of pre-school readiness program. And in the juvenile justice system, programs like the multi-systemic approach that has a basic family component, family strengthening, how to work with that offender back in the home setting, after four months of intervention has had results four years out. All of those have that family component.

So I think we need to take note of that, not that that is the only thing you need to do; there are a lot of other components to the intervention as well. But take note of that, and make sure we pay attention to family components as well as community strengthening.

Mr. Ford. Administrator, I did mean to thank you_and I hope that we all listened, all of my colleagues and I. I would hope that, as you develop your thoughts on these issues even more, as they sort of come together, that you wouldn't mind putting me on your mailing list, as I know the rest of the committee members are as well. I would appreciate it, as we sort of work through this process.

I praise Commissioner Montoya. But, Mr. Bilchik, I am deeply impressed with the way you are able to compute numbers and talk at the same time, like you did for my colleague a few minutes ago. Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Ford. I deferred my turn earlier; I will take it now, and then we'll go to Mr. Payne next.

Ms. Montoya, I am going to ask you a question, but I am not going to ask you to answer it now. You can think about it for a minute, and I am going to talk to Mr. Bilchik about a couple of things I will talk to him about.

I, basically, am interested in what you view to be successful prevention activities, the various things you worked with and have seen out there in terms of the problems we are talking about today. We will come back to that in a few minutes.

Let me go, Mr. Bilchik, to you. You cited, I think, a 23 percent decline in, I guess it was the juvenile crime rate_

Mr. Bilchik. Violent juvenile crime rate.

Chairman Castle. Violent juvenile crime rate. I guess none of us would go so far as to say exactly why that is happening. A lot of people say it is the economy, and others say it is the programs, or whatever it may be. Are there any studies which try to pinpoint that more than just the crime rate, I guess, is pretty easy. I have never really totally trusted crime rates, frankly, having dealt with that at various other levels of government, because there tends to be some play there.

But, let's assume the rates are correct because they are looking at the same crimes for shifting populations per thousand, or whatever it may be. But, my question is, do you know of any studies which show the cause and effect of programs, or anything else, in reducing crime rates, or is it still pretty much anecdotal, from your experience?

Mr. Bilchik. I can share with you that much of what we learn about this is anecdotal, and my research staff informed me a long time ago, just because they had four or five anecdotes, didn't make it data. So I don't want to just simply feed back to you a bunch of anecdotes of what I hear from county commissioners, and mayors, and local practitioners about the impact of a whole range of programs.

But, unfortunately, we don't have that kind of research that controls for a hundred different things you would have to control for to figure out what exactly caused the overall crime decrease in violent juvenile crime.

Chairman Castle. It is almost impossible to do.

Mr. Bilchik. It would be extraordinarily expensive and very difficult to do. Instead, what we are trying to do is to measure the different basic components of those programs, and the different strategies that are being implemented, and to see what is having a major impact. We are seeing that normative behavior in communities is being changed, for example, by the increased presence of police. That that does have an effect on crime. We are seeing increased adult relationships for kids through the mentoring programs reducing crime. We are seeing after-school programs, like Boys and Girls Clubs, reducing crime. I can give you individual measurements, and say, if you put this together, how could the synergy be anything but effective in seeing those kinds of crime?

Chairman Castle. Let me go on to my next question. You have touched on this in a couple of other answers, but I am going to give it to you specifically here in a moment. I will tell you, I guess, a bias I have, and that is, something we do at the Federal Government, not we so much, but it has been done for years, decades and decades. We create programs and then we never really truthfully review these programs in a way that would really give us a good bottom-line answer. You get defenders of the program in the Congress of the United States, as well as in various administrations as they go along, for obvious reasons, and all of the sudden you are living with programs which, in truth, should have been cashed in a long time ago and put into something else.

So, my question is, I am pleased to know you have started a program to determine the effectiveness of juvenile prevention programs. Under current law, there are a number of programs you must fund, either due to legislative language or directions received

through the appropriations process. Can you give us any indication of whether or not these programs have been able to demonstrate their effectiveness? If you are required to use available research and demonstration dollars in a specific manner, are there types of research demonstration programs which you would fund which you cannot fund under current restrictions? I mean, I am asking you to just take the wraps off and give it to us straight as to what works and doesn't work, and what we should get rid of.

Mr. Bilchik. Right. What we have tried to do_and I think we have been fairly successful at_is, when we begin a new effort, to make sure we associate an evaluation with it. And when we are doing something like the JUMP Program, we are going to evaluate the JUMP Program, and set up a national evaluation, as well as support local evaluations through the self-evaluation book that we give to the communities that can help them with that.

Even the title V program, which did not have money separate and apart for evaluation up until last year, we began through the annual report process, to hire an evaluation team to let us know what kind of results we were getting out of this community-led, neighborhood-based program that was instituting prevention activities at the local level.

And we are seeing that they are resulting in good things; that we have some results from those evaluations, our comprehensive gang demonstration program, another area of activity created under the JJDP Act. We are doing a major national evaluation, and the initial indications back from that evaluation show us good outcomes for the kids. It is premature to say that we have the final evaluation in, because the numbers are still low, but we are seeing that we are not just going to fund a gang program, and spend $2.5 million a year, and not evaluate it. So, when I put together the testimony, and cited to some of the things that we now have evidence of, it is just the tip of the iceberg.

There are evaluations associated with at least another dozen major activities that we are monitoring and will be able to report to communities. What does that result in? When you look at the subgrants for the 80 percent of the funds that do go into local communities through a formula process, it starts to surface when you see what they are funding. Again, we have no control over exactly what they are going to fund, what kind of program. But, all of the sudden, we get good results on mentoring through our evaluations, and then I have more mentoring programs funded out of the formula program that we do out of our dedicated program.

By the same token, we are starting to get good results in the gang activities. We are starting to see more and more gang activities funded out of the formula program. So I think that we are setting up the construct that can work, but it would be difficult, like I said before, to associate an evaluation with each and every individual program. Instead, I think we need to be thinking in a broader way about how to inform the Nation.

Chairman Castle. Well, I hope that is correct, and I hope that, as these evaluations come along, there are some real consequences. If something is evaluated and turns out not to be working really well, somebody makes a tough decision to make that change. I'm not faulting you at all, don't get me wrong, but I just think governments do this in general. We tend to limp along too much. I am sort of running out of time here_do you

have a brief response?

Mr. Bilchik. I guarantee you one thing, and that is, when we get these results, we publicize them. When we get the results, and we learn lessons about what is not effective, we publicize those, too. I didn't shrink back, when we learned that we had mixed results on our bootcamp project, to get the word out as to what happened, and then to try to inform people as to why it happened, so they could learn and institute better bootcamp programs.

Chairman Castle. Maybe you should talk to other committees of Congress and parts of the administration about reporting the facts they find about everything; it might be helpful.

Ms. Montoya, let's get back to the prevention question. If you could answer fairly briefly, please?

Ms. Montoya. Sure. Mr. Chairman, when we take a look at what is happening with our programs in the area of prevention, we think that just the overall addressing a positive youth development, and really gearing ourselves toward what that means, is a big piece of the prevention model_really looking to see what is happening with our young people, and helping them to see the consequences of certain behaviors. There is no doubt, when we take a look at what is happening to many of our youth that come into our programs, we see a higher rate of substance and drug abuse, particularly if they have been out on the street, and oftentimes even after their experience of running away. If they weren't in that before, there is the possibility of them turning to that to help them transition and get through these difficult times.

So, we see the need for a lot of drug education in order to really help them understand what it is that they are looking at, what the consequences would be, and what it would do to them and their lives. So, prevention from the perspective of really pushing a positive youth development, and what that means, and then generally education, particularly the intervention and working one on one with these youth in these programs.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, I appreciate that.

Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne. Thank you very much. I understand there in the past has been an emphasis on attempting to have prevention, and also, though, with minorities, focus on the disproportionate number of minorities in confinement, but also after confinement, that there would be emphasis on the youngsters while they are incarcerated to see, I guess about trying to prevent recidivism. I understand that that part of the program has been scrapped, so to speak, there, and the programs concentrating, once incarcerated. And I just wonder, what is that_and how do you expect to try to reduce recidivism, if there is

going to be no emphasis once they are incarcerated?

Mr. Bilchik. Mr. Payne, the position of the administration is that that actually should remain in effect in relation to disproportion or to confinement issues; that there needs to be attention, if I understand the question correctly, across the entire range of activities; that you need to work on prevention programs and learn why more minority children are coming into the system, and what you can do to prevent that.

But, you also need to look at the system itself. As the studies that have been done show, as juvenile offenders penetrate the system, from arrest, to intake, to court hearing, and to placement, they penetrate deeper and deeper as a higher percentage than their population should call for into that system. Those studies control for things that you would say would explain it away. It controls for prior history information. It controls for the type of offense. When you control for those things, and you still see the penetration at a higher level, then you know you need some programming alternatives. You know you need some training of staff to work on those issues, and a way to make that problem better.

Mr. Payne. So, the position of the administration is that that should continue as they are in the system?

Mr. Bilchik. Yes, Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne. I do have a question. I sat in on the original authorization. At that time, it was the Juvenile Justice, Delinquency and Prevention Act in 1973, when Burt Beyer originally sponsored it, and there was a question of status offenders being separated, you know, from hardened criminals. There were a lot of cases where truants were thrown in with hardened criminals, and the whole move was to separate. But I see we are creeping back to where the status offender could be in an adult prison for 24 hours_well, now it is 48 hours, If it is a weekend, it could be a little bit longer.

The business of separation, it used to be sight and sound; now it is sort of incident_as long as there is incidental supervised contact, they could be commingled. The question of 48 hours for the removal of a juvenile from an adult prison, well, now it can go up to seven days. You know, coming from 18 down to 15, some want 13-year-olds to be tried as adults, maybe 11-year-olds.

What is the move for this? Is it that, if we become harder on youngsters, we will prevent crime, is that it? Or, there's not the move to separate youngsters from hardened criminals? Is it a move back towards the dark ages?

Mr. Bilchik. I actually think that the provisions as they are laid out in H.R. 1818 and in Mr. Greenwood's bill pretty much keep the protections in place as they relate to de-institutionalization of status offenders, separation, and jail lock-up removal. As I mentioned, we have concerns about the disproportionate minority confinement provision,

but those three are being tinkered with in a way to create more flexibility.

But, to be honest with you, we tried to create the same flexibility in our own administration regulations two years ago, and trying to be responsive to local communities, and what they were telling us they needed, while still protecting these children to have a little more flexibility in executing these provisions. We think we did that. We think that H.R. 1818 and the new bill also kind of reflect that. So, we do not have that much alarm about where we are headed. I think there is some finetuning, but not a major overhaul of those three sections that we would be interested in talking to Mr. Greenwood about.

Mr. Payne. So we can anticipate, if it is the same leadership three years from now, we have 24 to 48, it could be 48 to 72, you know, this flexibility. Or, as we see it moving, in my opinion, in the wrong direction.

Mr. Bilchik. I would hope that we do not find that creep. I hope we would find that, if we are going to be flexible and move the extension out from a 24-hour to a 48-hour, that that is being responsive to what we are hearing from officials in local communities, that can still protect children's interests, keep them separated from adult offenders and delinquents, and not see that kind of creep over time.

Mr. Greenwood. I know the gentleman doesn't have any time, but if he would yield the time that he doesn't have to me for a second?

I would just like to comment that what you're seeing there in that change does not reflect a philosophical change. It reflects an attempt to maintain the philosophical objective, and just merging a little bit of practicality. I can assure the gentleman, there is no shift in the philosophical belief system.

Mr. Payne. Sometimes practical things inadvertently create serious problems, and the move to get away from_it was impractical in 1973, too. The reason why they threw kids in Texas who ran away in a jail with an alleged murder was it was practical. It certainly makes it more difficult to run that kid around to a youth detention place. It was just easier_matter of fact, they don't even let him stay there. Of course, you should read some of the accounts up until 1973 of, particularly, the Texas prisons. But, I am glad it is not a philosophical shift, and hope that the practicality doesn't slip us into getting back to the way it used to be.

Mr. Bilchik. Mr. Payne, if I could add, Mr. Chairman, just briefly, that when I look at the whole package of what has been presented for these three areas of activity, there are actually things that make it stronger, in terms of what we are doing day to day for kids in this situation. When I look at the protections that the bill provides that require the kind of full report and assessment on a status offender who is going to be held on a violation of a valid court order_we have never required that before. But, it is a good, healthy step.

I can tell you that local service providers will say, ''You are really pushing us to the limit to do this." But, if we're going to hold a status offender in this situation, we should make sure we know what is going on with that child, and perform that assessment, and get that report to the court within, I believe, it is the 48-hour time period that Mr. Greenwood contemplates.

Chairman Castle. Mr. Payne, if I may, that was language that I had inserted in the bill last time in order to make the shift. I wanted that extra requirement.

Okay. Thank you very much. That is going to bring to a conclusion our hearing. But first, Mr. Kildee wishes to have a brief closing statement.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to thank you for having this hearing, and thank the witnesses for their very excellent testimony.

Mr. Tancredo asked a question as to the cost of the programs through the 25 years, and it certainly is a legitimate question. I think, also, another part of that question, though, is the savings that we may have made during those years_not just the moral, human savings, but the actual dollar savings.

Just to go back to the young gentleman I mentioned earlier in my opening statement, I think it is quite likely that he would have wound up in the Michigan penal system, at a cost of about $30,000 a year, and that was about 10 years ago, so $300,000. Plus, the fact that he is now paying into the treasury, rather than drawing on the treasury.

So, I think when we talk about cost, we also have to talk about the savings that we make, the human savings, but even the very fiscal savings. I think we on this committee have to make sure, while we want to know the price of things, we also want to know the value of things.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Castle. Thank you, Mr. Kildee.

Again, I thank everyone. There was very substantial participation by the committee. I don't know if that was the quality of the witnesses, or the fact that it is springtime, or nothing else is happening out there today.

[Laughter.]

But, in any event, we appreciate that interest. As you know, we are trying to press forward with Mr. Greenwood's legislation, so we will probably be in close touch with you as we work that out. But, thank you for being here today and giving us your time.

With that, we stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

Appendix A The Statement Of Shay Bilchik, Administrator, Office Of Juvenile Justice And Delinquency Prevention, United States Department Of Justice.

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Washington, D.C. 20531

STATEMENT

OF

THE HONORABLE SHAY BILCHIK
ADMINISTRATOR
OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

JUVENILE CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 25, 1999
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and our perspective on legislative approaches to addressing the prevention and control of serious and violent juvenile crime. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, OJJDP is the Federal office with primary responsibility for working with states and local communities to combat and prevent juvenile crime and violence, improve the juvenile justice system, and address juvenile victimization.

When I testified before this Subcommittee in 1997, I spoke of the decline in the 1995 overall juvenile violent crime arrest rate and the even greater decline in the juvenile murder arrest rate. I'm pleased to tell you today that we are continuing to move in the right direction. After steady increases from 1989 to 1994, the juvenile arrest rate for Part I violent crime has dropped for 3 straight years, falling 23 percent from 1994 to 1997. We have also seen significant declines in every type of violent crime index offense, including a 43 percent drop in the juvenile murder arrest rate from 1993 to 1997.

This positive trend is due, in part, to a movement toward a balanced approach to juvenile crime: one that combines prevention programs for at-risk youth with early intervention and sanctions that hold offenders accountable at every stage of the juvenile justice system.

While as a nation we can celebrate these achievements, we cannot rest. Although juvenile violent crime rates continue to fall, they are still 23 percent above the 1988 level. In addition, arrest rates for both violent and nonviolent offenses are still at unacceptably high levels. Drug use and weapons offenses arrests, for example, are up 125 percent and 44 percent, respectively, between 1988 and 1997. Also, the trends for female juvenile violent crime arrest rates, which

have risen faster and fallen slower than for males, are cause for concern, as are the disproportionately high arrest rates for minorities.

OJJDP's basic premise is that juvenile crime is primarily a state and local issue. Our primary Federal role is to provide assistance and guidance through support for research, evaluation, statistics, demonstration and replication of programs, training and technical assistance, and information sharing. In partnership with states and local communities, we will continue to work toward balanced, comprehensive, and community-wide approaches to preventing and combating juvenile crime. We also need to continue to ensure that we invest in programs and strategies that work.

Two years ago before this Subcommittee, I laid out what I believed to be the critical, although limited, Federal role in assisting states and localities. Today I still firmly believe that the Federal Government has a crucial role to play in the juvenile justice arena. Specifically, OJJDP's role continues to be to perform functions that are national in scope and best accomplished through Federal action.

Before I discuss where we are in relation to what I see as OJJDP's four main function areas, I think it will be helpful if I first describe the strategy that has served, since 1993, as the foundation of nearly all our efforts. I cannot overstate the importance of our Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. It provides a strategic planning framework for states and communities to increase their ability to effectively combat juvenile delinquency and victimization and provide for public safety. Based on three decades of research on what causes juvenile delinquency and what works to address it, the Comprehensive Strategy emphasizes six key principles:

1. Strengthening families as their children's first and primary teachers and role models.
2. Supporting core social institutions such as schools, religious institutions, and community organizations in their efforts to develop youth who will lead productive and law-abiding lives.
3. Promoting prevention as the most cost-effective approach to reducing delinquency.
4. Intervening immediately and effectively at the first sign of high-risk behaviors that can lead to delinquency.
5. Establishing a system of graduated sanctions designed to hold every juvenile offender accountable while providing appropriate rehabilitation services.
6. Identifying and controlling the small group of serious violent juvenile offenders who account for the great majority of serious violent juvenile crime.

These principles form the basis for establishing a continuum of care—from prevention to early intervention to graduated sanctions—that can prevent delinquency, reduce the reoccurrence of such behavior, and build a juvenile justice system that can deliver the right sanctions and services to the right youth at the right time and in a cost-effective manner. Keeping the Comprehensive Strategy in mind as the basis of our approach to our mission, I'd like to turn now to a discussion of the four major OJJDP functions that I mentioned.

Function 1: Develop, test, and demonstrate new programs and strategies and conduct evaluations to identify what works and what doesn't.

The Comprehensive Strategy, which is a prime example of what OJJDP accomplishes under this function, has now moved into a training and technical assistance mode as we help communities adapt the strategy to their own particular needs. Other more recent program efforts

include this year's exciting and innovative joint effort with the U.S. Department of Education, the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, and the Justice Department's Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services. Together, we are launching the new Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative, which through a single application process (almost unprecedented in Federal programs) will help schools and communities enhance and implement comprehensive community-wide strategies for creating safe and drug-free schools and promoting healthy childhood development. These strategies can include efforts such as conflict resolution programming, alternative education, family therapy, school-based probation, and hiring additional school resource officers.

Successful projects will receive support for up to three years. We expect to make awards to up to 50 sites, ranging from up to $3 million per year for urban school districts, up to $2 million per year for suburban schools, and up to $1 million per year for rural school districts and tribal schools. The program solicitation will be out next week, and even though funding comes from four agencies, there will be only one application.

In terms of evaluating new programs and strategies, we are funding evaluations of every one of our major demonstration and replication programs. Last year, for example, we began an evaluation the Comprehensive Strategy training and technical assistance process. We are conducting a long-term national evaluation to examine local program implementation and outcomes. We have also published the *Title V Community Prevention Grants Program: Community Self-Evaluation Workbook*, which is helping jurisdictions to better evaluate their community prevention programs under Title V to measure the extent to which they are impacting juvenile crime. Last month we submitted to Congress our *Juvenile Mentoring Program: 1998*

Report to Congress, which highlights initial evaluation findings from the 93 previously awarded JUMP sites. Mentoring program youth participants reported that mentoring helped them stay away from alcohol and drugs, keep away from gangs, and avoid using guns and knives. We are continuing this evaluation to better analyze the impact of mentoring programs.

Function 2: Gather statistical information on national, state, and local levels that inform program development and implementation.

OJJDP supports a series of statistical studies that inform policymakers, the juvenile justice field, and the public about juvenile crime causes and trends. We are just completing our 1998 National Report on Juvenile Offenders and Victims, a followup to our 1995 report. OJJDP is also implementing a complementary set of statistical series designed to describe juveniles in custody and the facilities in which they are located. The Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement provides a complete count and description of juveniles placed in residential custody by the juvenile justice system. The Juvenile Residential Facility Census provides a comprehensive overview of the facilities as well as the services provided to youth in their care.

Finally, the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement will collect actual reports from juveniles in custody concerning their current offense and previous offenses. It will identify the pathways these youth followed to custody and the risk or protective factors that affected these pathways. Together, these three series will provide powerful information about the detention and correctional system and how it can better address the needs of youth in custody while protecting the community. The Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement was first implemented in October 1997, the Juvenile Residential Facility Census will be ready for implementation in October 2000, and the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement will be implemented in 2001.

Function 3: Support demonstration and replication programs and provide hands-on training and technical assistance and disseminate information to help communities design and implement effective programs and strategies.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of specific programs and strategies, OJJDP develops and funds promising programs. If these programs are successful, OJJDP makes available to communities the kind of assistance necessary for implementing the programs locally. The following is a sample of ongoing OJJDP replication and training and technical assistance programs.

- Our Title V Community Prevention Grants help local communities come together to design and implement comprehensive, interdisciplinary delinquency prevention efforts based on a risk- and protective-factor approach. Through this program, we provide training and technical assistance to help local planning teams assess the prevention needs and resources of their communities and develop a plan that ensures quality programming and an effective investment. Since 1994, we have provided Key Leader Orientation to more than 3,200 community leaders in more than 620 communities and Risk and Resource Assessment training to more than 2,600 individuals in 550 communities. To date, 619 communities have received Title V prevention grants.
- OJJDP's Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) is a key, school-related prevention effort that stresses funding programs at the local level. JUMP programs provide one-to-one mentoring and are based on partnerships that include the local education agency and public or private nonprofit agencies. We recently funded 73 new JUMP programs, bringing the combined total to 166 programs in 41 states. These new awards will help

more than 7,500 at-risk youth in grades 1–12 stay in school and away from drugs and crime. Further, many States use their Title V funds to support other mentoring programs.

In Fiscal Year 1998, Congress appropriated $5 million to OJJDP for the Drug Prevention Program. We funded the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado. With OJJDP support, the Center had recently identified and begun the replication process for 10 delinquency prevention and intervention programs that met the highest standards of program effectiveness. The Center described these programs in a series of publications called *Blueprints*. We are funding the replication of one of the *Blueprints* drug prevention programs, the Life Skills Training Program. The Center is also providing training and technical assistance to competitively selected sites to implement the Life Skills Training Program. This year we will continue to provide funding to the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence and also award funding directly to competitively selected sites to implement a second *Blueprint* drug prevention program.

OJJDP is currently partnering with the Office of National Drug Control Policy on the Drug-Free Communities Support Program, which supports community-wide coalitions to reduce youth substance abuse. Each coalition has engaged youth, parents, media, schools, and law enforcement in preventing youth drug abuse. In Fiscal Year 1998, we awarded $8.7 million to 93 sites. This year, the Office of National Drug Control Policy and OJJDP will award an additional 100 competitive grants of up to $100,000 each. The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is providing technical assistance to the grantees, all of which are participating in a

national evaluation.

- Breaking the "cycle of violence" is essential to any comprehensive juvenile crime reduction strategy. The link between the abuse and neglect of a child and later criminal behavior is well documented. In partnership with the Office of Justice Program's Violence Against Women Office and Executive Office for Weed and Seed, we are currently supporting five comprehensive community-wide efforts to stop child abuse and neglect through the Safe Kids-Safe Streets program. The five sites are Huntsville, Alabama; the Sault Sainte Marie Tribe of the Chippewa Indians in Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan; Kansas City, Missouri; Toledo, Ohio; and Chittenden County, Vermont. Their efforts include collaboration between the criminal and juvenile justice systems to improve the handling of child abuse cases and coordinating parenting programs and support services to protect youth who are at risk of being abused or neglected.
- Another program that is helping to break the cycle of violence was developed in 1993 by Yale University, in partnership with the New Haven Police Department and with OJJDP support. The Child Development-Community Policing program model trains police officers and mental health professionals to work in collaboration to provide direct intervention and treatment to youth who are victims or witnesses of violent crime. Building on the success of the Yale-New Haven project with the $10 million Congress provided this year, OJJDP will select up to 12 additional sites to receive cooperative agreements for up to 5 years under the Safe Start initiative. We are also funding a national evaluation of this program.

In our continuing efforts to promote and support the Comprehensive Strategy, OJJDP is

currently providing training and technical assistance to six states and two others will soon begin the strategic planning process. Each of these eight states has identified up to six local jurisdictions to develop local plans in coordination with state efforts.

- Another important area where OJJDP is focusing technical assistance efforts is in the too-often underserved Native American communities where violent crime rates—unlike those in the rest of the nation—continue to rise and where juveniles are victimized at twice the national rates. OJJDP is working with representatives of the Native American community to identify the major problems of tribal youth and determine the best methods of addressing these needs. Based on our meetings with representatives of the Native American community, we will administer the FY 1999 Tribal Youth Program in a manner that takes into account each tribe's unique heritage and to work closely with tribal elders. We will be coordinating this delinquency prevention and control program with other Department of Justice bureaus and with the U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Service.
- OJJDP provides extensive training and technical assistance to help law enforcement address such areas as gangs, safe schools, serious and violent delinquency (SHOCAP), Internet exploitation of children, and missing and exploited children cases.

The impact of all of OJJDP's activities is multiplied by our intensive commitment to share information on research, statistics, and effective programs with those who need it. In 1998, we distributed 3.5 million copies of our publications, responded to 44,000 requests for information, and provided support to 136 national and local conferences. Our Web site, which

was visited more than 90,000 times in 1998, has been redesigned to include even more publications, program descriptions, and other useful information. In addition, we sponsored six national satellite conferences in 1998, broadcasting to an average of more than 450 viewing sites and 13,000 people.

Let me give you a few specific examples of some particularly noteworthy recent publications:

- We expanded our Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse series for field professionals who respond to child victimization issues.
- Perhaps our proudest recent publishing achievement was the release of *When Your Child Is Missing: A Family Survival Guide*, which was written for parents by other parents who have endured the trauma of their child being abducted. We sent the *Guide* to every law enforcement agency and public library in the country and to other interested organizations and, as of the end of January, have distributed nearly 74,000 copies nationwide. Work is currently underway to translate the *Guide* into Spanish.
- We prepared *The Coach's Playbook Against Drugs*, in collaboration with the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The *Playbook* provides athletic coaches with guidance on how to steer their athletes away from drug use. To date we have distributed more than 70,000 copies to schools and athletic organizations.
- In partnership with the U.S. Department of Education's Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, OJJDP published *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools*, a research-based guide developed to assist school personnel, parents, and community members in identifying potentially violent youth.

Function 4: Conduct basic research and studies that will help communities enhance and improve the way they respond to juvenile crime.

Research is key to any comprehensive strategy to combat juvenile crime because it allows us to fully determine the scope of the problem and the most effective responses.

Last March we published the findings and recommendations of a major research undertaking, our Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders. Over a period of two years, 22 researchers analyzed the current research on the development of serious violent juvenile offending careers and integrated it with information on the effectiveness of prevention and intervention programs. The panel concluded that it is never too early to begin efforts to prevent serious and violent juvenile crime and that for the vast majority of offenders it is never too late to intervene. The panel also found that in many instances the eventual serious violent juvenile offenders start offending before age 10. We are currently working with a second study group to examine very young offenders to determine the best methods of steering these youth away from more serious crimes.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn to consideration of legislative initiatives that will affect OJJDP's future. During the first session of the 105th Congress, the Administration transmitted to the Congress the "Anti-Gang and Youth Violence Act of 1997." It was introduced in the House as H.R. 810 by Representative Schumer and in the Senate as S. 362.

The Administration's proposal was designed to combine elements of enforcement and prosecution with targeted prevention and intervention efforts. The bill continued the leadership

role of OJJDP and the Department of Justice in coordinating Federal efforts to prevent and control juvenile delinquency and address missing and exploited children's issues through the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Concentration of Federal Efforts Program. The bill continued our centerpiece Formula Grants Program, providing state and local governments with flexible funding to address the prevention and control of delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system. The Formula Grants Program would retain the core requirements of the Act that provide basic protections to juveniles in the juvenile justice system. However, they were modified to provide state and local governments with additional flexibility in implementing these requirements.

The bill also proposed a dedicated Indian Tribal Grants Program to provide direct categorical funding to Native American jurisdictions to address the prevention and control of delinquency and improve their juvenile justice systems. A new At-Risk Children's Program would provide expanded authority to fund prevention and early intervention programs through a discretionary grant program modeled after the current Title V–Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. The bill provided OJJDP with a continuing role in supporting State and local program formulation and implementation by providing discretionary grant authority to develop, test, and demonstrate programs having a high probability of improving the juvenile justice system.

A new Incentive Grants Program would provide targeted formula funding to states to support activities designed to address priority needs. Under the Incentive Grants Program, states would be required to provide a system of accountability-based sanctions for juvenile offenders and a plan for improving record keeping systems at the state and local levels as a condition of

participating in the program. Other authorized funding areas included juvenile firearms; information systems; serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders; juvenile detention and corrections programs; disproportionate minority confinement; and other issues identified as priorities by the Administrator, such as hate crimes, gender specific services, and rural crime prevention.

The proposal also provided a research, evaluation, and statistical program that would be implemented through a collaboration among OJJDP, the National Institute of Justice, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Finally, a dedicated Training and Technical Assistance program would support needed services at the State and local levels. In the child protection area, the Administration's bill proposed to reauthorize the Missing and Exploited Children's program established under Title IV of the Missing and Exploited Children's Act.

Although the Administration's proposal was not actively considered by Congress, elements of the proposal were integrated into H.R. 1818 when it was formulated, considered, and passed by the House on July 15, 1997. The House approach to reauthorization was to consider two separate bills: H.R. 1818 and H.R. 3. H.R. 1818 restructured OJJDP as the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention, enhancing the office's ability to support state and local delinquency control, prevention, and system improvement programs. It contained a modified Formula Grants program that would have provided flexibility to state and local governments in a manner similar to the Administration's bill. It also consolidated several existing grant programs into a flexible delinquency prevention and early intervention block grant program. To enhance these programs, H.R. 1818 established a Federal support program for research, evaluation, and statistics that was to be tied to the programs of the National Institute of

Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. It also authorized technical assistance and training; information collection and dissemination; development, testing, and demonstration of programs that have the potential to control, reduce, and prevent juvenile crime.

While H.R. 1818 would have provided OJJDP with the tools necessary to assist state and local governments to address juvenile violence and delinquency, there are a number of areas within the bill that we would like to see addressed as this committee examines H.R. 1150, the identical bill Mr. Greenwood and others introduced on March 17,1999.

We believe it is important that the Administrator's authority to regulate program implementation not be limited to ensuring compliance with Act requirements or responding to requests for guidance or clarification. This limitation would make it difficult for OJJDP to provide the type of advanced program guidance and clarity that is essential to sound program administration.

I also believe it is important for a juvenile justice reauthorization bill to continue the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Coordinating Council, particularly since being restructured in the 1992 reauthorization to include citizen practitioner members, has served as an effective vehicle to establish overall Federal juvenile justice goals, objectives, and priorities and to coordinate juvenile justice programing among Federal agencies.

Among its key achievements, in response to the Attorney General's call for a "National Agenda for Children," the Council developed *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan* to support state and local efforts to comprehensively address needs of the juvenile justice system. In 1997, the Coordinating Council expanded the

Action Plan and played a key role in securing the funding of projects designed to support the objectives of the *Plan*. For example, OJJDP, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Centers for Disease Control are now funding "Early Alliance," a research study designed to promote positive development and reduce risks for adverse outcomes in children attending schools in at-risk neighborhoods. Other interagency collaborations include addressing nurse home visitation programs; career enrichment for inner city youth; mental health needs of at-risk youth; treatment for children with learning disabilities; drug awareness education and prevention; national replication of the Child Development - Community Policing Program; and addressing the multiple needs of families with substance abuse problems.

We believe that the cost of supporting the Coordinating Council, approximately $200,000 annually, is a sound investment, and we look forward to working with the Subcommittee to ensure the continuation of the Coordinating Council.

The proposed Formula Grants Program contains four statutory core requirements that provide basic protections for juveniles in the juvenile justice system. We believe that the flexibility in its deinstitutionalization of status offenders, separation of juveniles from adults, and jail and lock-up removal requirements is appropriate.

However, the disproportionate minority confinement plan requirement should not be limited to prevention and system improvement efforts designed to reduce the number of minority juveniles who "come into contact" with the juvenile justice system. Disproportionate minority confinement results, in part, from a lack of programs and services for minority youth prior to their having contact with the juvenile justice system. However, it may also result from decisions

and factors that take place within the juvenile justice system after the juvenile enters the system. Therefore, we believe that the disproportionate minority confinement requirement should continue to address the overrepresentation of minority youth in secure detention and confinement that results from factors and circumstances that take place both prior to the juvenile entering the system and those that occur after the juvenile has entered the system.

It is our position that the core requirements represent minimum protections for juveniles who come into the juvenile justice system. We believe that tying eligibility for funds to compliance with these requirements is an important incentive for state and local governments to operate their juvenile justice systems in a manner that keeps children safe from physical and psychological harm. While we agree with the concept that some portion of the Formula Grants allocations should be available to a state regardless of its compliance with the core requirements, we believe that noncompliance with any one or more of the core requirements should result in a loss of eligibility for 50 percent of the total allocation to a state, rather than a 12.5 percent fund loss for each individual core requirement.

We believe that any new block grant program should provide for direct state awards to units of local government that would, in turn, contract with eligible service providers to carry out local prevention and early intervention programs. This is the current scheme under Title V of the Act and has worked effectively to provide awards to some 650 units of local government to implement comprehensive delinquency prevention plans.

Over the past two years, we have begun to build a juvenile justice system infrastructure that would serve to enhance juvenile accountability and to establish a system of graduated

sanctions that would respond to the needs of offenders in the juvenile justice system. This system is being developed under the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program. While we broadly support this type of programming, we would welcome discussion about an appropriate program structure designed to establish a system of graduated sanctions that, joined with prevention and early intervention programs, provides a continuum of care. Our recommendation is that such a program should:

1. Be premised on the principle that the juvenile justice system must serve a number of important goals, including holding juveniles accountable, providing treatment that responds to the identified needs of each juvenile, and addressing the needs of victims of juvenile crime. Each of these elements is critical to an effective system of graduated sanctions that holds offenders accountable.
2. Be integrated with prevention and early intervention programming.
3. Be focused on the juvenile justice system and be designed to retain in the juvenile justice system juveniles who are amenable to treatment and rehabilitation.
4. Provide States, local governments, and communities with the flexibility to prioritize and address identified needs with available funding, while not creating new Federal mandates that would interfere with State determinations of priorities and needs within the juvenile justice system.

In addition to any new block grant programs, we believe that it is critical to maintain a strong Federal role in developing, testing, and demonstrating new programs; providing ongoing research, evaluation, and statistics programming to support informed State and local decisionmaking; providing training and technical assistance designed to transfer knowledge and

skills to juvenile justice system practitioners; and disseminating current and essential information about the results of program testing and demonstration.

To that end, we recommend that the authorizations for these functions be established at sufficient levels to provide a high level of support. This year, in addition to base appropriations for these functions under our Part C National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, we are authorized to allocate up to 10 percent of appropriated program funds to support program related research, evaluation, and statistics functions and up to 2 percent to support related training and technical assistance activities. We recommend this approach be incorporated in the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Act in the 106th Congress.

Finally, I should mention an administrative point of concern. I believe it is essential that any new legislation include provisions to support the transition to a new office and program structure and permit the continuation of programs and the continuity of office staff.

Mr. Chairman, in sum, OJJDP and the Department of Justice look forward to working with you and with the Subcommittee to formulate House reauthorization legislation that will provide the statutory framework to continue the significant and substantial progress that state and local governments have made in addressing the prevention and control of delinquency and the improvement of the juvenile justice system.

I look forward to answering any questions you might have.

Appendix B The Written Statement Of Patricia Montoya, Commissioner Of The Administrator On Children, Youth, And Families, U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services.

Intro Ms Patricia Montoya:

Ms. Patricia Montoya serves as the Commissioner of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) at the Department of Health and Human Services. As Commissioner, she oversees the implementation of federal programs that assist vulnerable children and youth. Prior to her current position she was the Regional Director of Region Six for the Department of Health and Human Services. Her wide-ranging responsibilities included implementation, oversight, and public speaking on Medicaid managed care, the Children's Health Insurance Program, teen pregnancy, welfare reform, child care, Safe Passages for Youth, and community development.

Before joining the Administration, Ms. Montoya was Practice Manager for Presbyterian Family Healthcare, a hospital-based primary and urgent care center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. From 1989 to 1993, she served as the Executive Director of New Mexico Health Resources, also in Albuquerque, and for two years she served as Assistant Director for the American Nurses Association.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

STATEMENT OF

PATRICIA MONTOYA

COMMISSIONER
ADMINISTRATION ON CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ON
THE REAUTHORIZATION OF
THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 25, 1999

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee,

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee to discuss the importance of programs serving youth and to express the Administration's strong support for reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. I would particularly like to thank Chairman Castle, Mr. Greenwood and other members of the Subcommittee for the leadership you have demonstrated by introducing H.R. 1150, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act, which includes provisions to strengthen and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. It is my understanding that H.R. 1150 is identical to H.R. 1818, which passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support in the last Congress. As you know, Secretary Shalala wrote to the Subcommittee in June 1997, expressing the Department's support for the enactment of the title of the H.R. 1818 addressing the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

Unfortunately, although both the House and the Senate passed bills to reauthorize the Act during the last Congress, time ran out before a final bill could be enacted. Therefore, we hope that this year, marking the 25th anniversary of the Runaway and Homeless Youth program, we will be able to continue a tradition of bipartisan support and enact final reauthorizing legislation.

It is estimated that between 500,000 and 1.5 million children and youth run away from home each year. A 1988 study estimated that over 127,000 children were "thrownaways" – children who had been told to leave the house, abandoned, or prevented from returning home. Many youth are leaving homes affected by abuse, neglect, substance abuse, mental illness, or other family problems.

To help meet the needs of these very vulnerable youth, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes three grant programs: the **Basic Center Program**, which provides temporary emergency shelter to runaway youth, while working to reunite them with their families when possible; the **Transitional Living Program**, which provides longer-term residential, educational and vocational services to homeless youth to enable them to develop the skills they need to become self-sufficient young adults; and the **Street Outreach Program**, which reaches out to young people on the streets to protect them from sexual abuse or exploitation and to help connect them to needed services and community supports. In fiscal year 1998, these three programs together served about 75,000 youth. Over 20,000 of these youth reported that they had experienced physical abuse with their households. About 9,000 reported sexual abuse while at home and 14,000 reported being neglected. Forty-seven percent of the youth reported that a household member was abusing alcohol or drugs. Thirteen percent of the youth reported that they had attempted suicide.

The programs and support systems authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act serve as a critical lifeline to youth and their families. They provide a safe place to turn in times of crisis and they offer the services, training, skills and, most importantly, the positive support youth need to help them make the transition to healthy, productive lives as adults.

I would like to share a couple of stories that illustrate the importance of youth programs.

- In Los Angeles, I visited the Los Angeles Youth Network, which operates a shelter program, a drop-in center and an aftercare program for youth transitioning out of their other programs. At the drop-in center, I met Shandra, a very mature 15 year old. Shandra had been a very good student and was involved with student government and other school activities. But she told me that "my mom and I just were not getting along, so I ran away." She came to the Los Angeles Youth Network, where they worked with her and her mother, allowing her to return home. Shandra said they helped her focus, provided support, helped her to gain a sense of personal responsibility for her life and helped her and her mom to get along better.

- In Texas, I met the director of the Central Texas Youth Service Bureau who told me about another young woman. She had run away from home at the age of 14 due to physical and sexual abuse and had found her way to their shelter for runaway youth. The shelter provided her with needed services, but then lost contact after she left their facility. Six years later, this young woman appeared at the shelter director's office and introduced herself. She reported that she had just graduated from nursing school and was getting married. She said she owed her life to the agency; if it had not been for their shelter and the caring staff, she probably would be dead.

We know that runaway and homeless youth programs make a real difference in the lives of young people. Recognizing the importance of these programs, the President's budget for fiscal year 2000 proposes to increase funding for the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act's Transitional

Living Program by 33 percent. This proposal, along with several initiatives to expand supports to youth aging out of the foster care system, is part of our overall effort to assist vulnerable youth in making a successful passage to adulthood. Assuring swift reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act is another key step in fulfilling our commitment to youth.

I would now like to take a few moments to provide more information on the programs and services authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and administered by the Family and Youth Services Bureau, within the Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

The Basic Center Program: The Basic Center Program funds youth shelters that provide emergency shelter for up to 15 days, as well as food, clothing, outreach services, and crisis intervention for runaway and homeless youth. The shelters offer services to help reunite youth with their families, whenever possible. Our most recent data show that approximately 60 percent of youth served by these programs are able to be reunited with their families or guardians. When this cannot be safely accomplished, shelters help youth to locate alternative secure living arrangements with relatives, friends or in foster homes.

The FY 1998 appropriation of $43.6 million supported more than 370 basic center projects across the country. Grantees, most of which are community-based organizations, receive an average grant of approximately $104,000 per year for a three-year period. Each federal dollar leverages, on average, more than two dollars for services to this population.

The Transitional Living Program: The Transitional Living Program (TLP) addresses the longer-term needs of homeless older youth. The program makes grants to community-based organizations to help homeless youth ages 16 - 21 to make a successful transition to self-sufficient adulthood by giving them the tools they need to live independently. The programs provide youth with a supervised place to live for up to 18 months, life skills training (such as how to budget, balance a checkbook, find an apartment or apply for a job), vocational training, and other support services. The TLP allows youth to complete their education, learn practical skills, and develop positive relationships with mentors and peers, while living in a safe and supported environment In this way, the program helps young people to become healthy, productive, self-sufficient adults, avoiding the risks of continued homelessness, long-term dependency on government aid or social services, or involvement with the criminal justice system.

A recent survey of transitional living programs found that 78 percent of young people participating in TLP programs were employed either part- or full-time, 74 percent of youth were discharged to stable housing at the completion of the program, and, six months after completing participation in the program, 78 percent remained free of all direct government aid

In FY 1998, an appropriation of $14 9 million enabled the Department to support over 75 TLP projects at an average of $181,000 per year for a three-year period. As I noted earlier, the President has proposed a 33 percent increase for this critically important and successful program, which would bring the appropriation in FY 2000 up to approximately $20 million

Street Outreach Program: The Street Outreach Program (or more formally the Education and Prevention Grant to Reduce Sexual Abuse of Runaway, Homeless, and Street Youth) was enacted as part of the Violence Against Women Act of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The purpose of this program is to provide street-based outreach and education, including treatment, counseling, and provision of information and referral for services to runaway, homeless and street youth who have been subjected to sexual abuse or are at risk of such abuse.

Today, the dangers facing youth on the street are greater than ever -- violence, drug abuse, sexual exploitation, as well as health risks unheard of 25 years ago, like AIDS and new antibiotic-resistant strains of tuberculosis. Service providers I have met have all emphasized the importance of reaching kids on the street as quickly as possible, before they have spent more than 2 months on the streets. After this point, there is a greater risk of losing them permanently to the dangers of the street.

Street outreach grantees offer services on the street during the hours young people tend to be out, including late afternoons, evenings, nights, and weekends. The programs use staff whose genders, ethnicities, and life experiences are similar to those of the young people to be served. street outreach grantees provide services from a youth development perspective and they involve youth in the design, operation and evaluation of the program. These grantees are also required to coordinate with state or local sexual assault coalitions or other agencies providing services to youth who have been or are at risk of being sexually assaulted or exploited.

The FY 1998 funding of $15 million for the street outreach program funded 138 grantees with experience in providing services to runaway, homeless, and street youth.

National Support Systems for Youth: In addition to the three grant programs, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes funds for a number of support activities.

- The **National Runaway Switchboard** is a national communications system designed to assist runaway youth and their families by linking them to crisis counseling, programs and resources, and each other, as appropriate. The goal for the system is to ensure that young people in crisis have one central place to turn to for information on the help available to them. The switchboard typically responds to more than 12,500 calls a month. To ensure access to all youth in need, the Switchboard has operators who are bilingual in Spanish and English. The switchboard also has access to AT&T's language line translation services, which can provide translation services for many languages that may not be spoken by switchboard operators. In addition, there is a special line for helping hearing-impaired youth to access the switchboard's services. The switchboard handles a wide range of calls, from counseling youth who are thinking of running away, to assisting youth who have run away from home find a safe place to go to get off the streets. The switchboard also assists parents who are worried about their teenage children's behavior. Switchboard operators can help a parent to figure out how to talk to their children and where to get more help in resolving family issues.

- The **National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth** serves as a central information source on youth and family policy and practice. The clearinghouse disseminates information to grantees and the public, helps the Family and Youth Services Bureau to organize critical-issue forums that bring together grantees and other experts on issues affecting youth, and assists in outreach and networking to other agencies and organizations working with youth.

- The **Regional Training and Technical Assistance Network** is a coordinated group of organizations, one in each of the 10 federal regions, that provides training and technical assistance to local grantees. The training and technical assistance providers organize regional and state-level conferences and workshops for grantees, provide on-site consultation and offer telephone consultation in order to assist grantees to provide well-managed, effective services for runaway, homeless and street youth.

Finally, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act provides support for much-needed data collection, evaluation, research and demonstration activities. These activities improve our understanding of the needs and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth and help us to develop effective interventions for assuring positive outcomes for these youth.

And, as we all recognize, assuring positive outcomes for our youth today is by no means easy. The Carnegie Report on Adolescent Development stressed that there has been an erosion of traditional support systems and neighborhood networks. It concluded, "Young adults from all

economic strata [now] find themselves alone in communities where there are few adults to turn to, and no safe places to go." The programs authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act assure that for some of the youth most at risk, those who have runaway or been pushed out of their homes, youth who are now sleeping in doorways or under bridges or hanging out in bus stations waiting to get thrown out, there will be a safe place to go with a caring adult.

In closing, I would like to emphasize how important I think it is that you are focusing on supporting youth. As commissioner of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, I have responsibility for overseeing a range of programs, including Head Start, child care and child welfare. I feel very strongly that we must provide a continuum of services to ensure that we are supporting our children every step of the way. The early years are critical – we know that and must continue to invest in early childhood – but we must also stick with kids as they grow older. Children are like gardens: it is critical that we prepare the soil and plant the seeds. But if that is *all* we do, we should not be surprised if they do not flourish. We have to pay attention to them on an ongoing basis. Just as one would fertilize a garden, we must stimulate growth in young people. Just as one would weed a garden, we must root out the negative influences, peer pressure and self-doubt that threaten to stunt the positive development of our children. Especially during pre-adolescence and adolescence, we must have continued youth development activities to provide something to which young people can say "yes" instead of just asking them to say "no" to risky behaviors.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act supports organizations across the country which help youth to do just that. On behalf of the Administration, I thank you for holding today's hearing. We look forward to working with you to enact bipartisan legislation to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, so that we may ensure that these programs continue to meet the needs of youth across the country. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

PATRICIA MONTOYA

Commissioner on Children, Youth and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Patricia Montoya serves as the Commissioner of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) at the Department of Health and Human Services. She was nominated for this position by President Clinton on July 17, 1998, was confirmed by the Senate on October 21, 1998 and was sworn-in by Vice President Gore in a ceremony on December 14, 1998.

Ms. Montoya controls a budget of over $12 billion and manages a staff of 180. She also serves as spokesperson for the Administration on issues related to child and youth development, early childhood education, child protective services, foster care, adoption and the challenges and opportunities facing children, youth and families.

Before assuming the leadership of ACYF, Patricia Montoya was the Regional Director of Region VI for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. She was appointed to this position on September 12, 1994 by Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services. As Regional Director, Ms. Montoya served as the Secretary's personal representative and was the liaison to federal, state and local elected officials, as well as private sector business and community leaders in the five-state region. Her wide-ranging responsibilities included implementation, oversight and public speaking on Medicaid managed care, the Children's Health Insurance Program, teen pregnancy, welfare reform, child care, Safe Passages for Youth, and community development.

Prior to joining the Administration, Ms. Montoya was Practice Manager for Presbyterian Family Healthcare, a hospital-based primary care and urgent care center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. From 1989 to 1993, she served as the executive director of New Mexico Health Resources in Albuquerque, and for two years she was in Washington, D.C., where she was Assistant Director for the American Nurses Association.

A nurse by training, Patricia Montoya has an extensive clinical background, including pediatrics, emergency room/urgent care, primary care outpatient and home health. Throughout her career, Ms. Montoya has worked to improve outcomes for children and families through her work in pediatrics, school health, community outreach and health policy.

Ms. Montoya was born in Albuquerque. She received her bachelor's degree in nursing in 1975 and her master's in public administration/health administration in 1983, both from the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Long active in Hispanic community and political activities, Ms. Montoya is a member of the National Hispanic Nurses Association; the American Nurses Association; and Sigma Theta Tau, the National Honor Society of Nursing. Other groups she has worked with include the National Advisory Council on Nursing Education and Practice; the White House Health Professional Review Group on Health Care Reform; the New Mexico Health Policy Commission – Geographic Access Committee on Health Manpower; the Board of Director of Family/Child Services; and Healthcare for the Homeless.

Ms. Montoya is married to Alfred Padilla.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Indexes

Chairman Castle, 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35
Mr. Bilchik, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
Mr. Ford, 28, 29
Mr. Greenwood, 7, 8, 9, 22, 34
Mr. Hinojosa, 24, 25
Mr. Kildee, 2, 10, 11, 35
Mr. Payne, 32, 33, 34
Mr. Schaffer, 11, 12, 13, 14
Mr. Scott, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19
Mr. Souder, 25, 26, 27
Mr. Tancredo, 21, 22, 23, 24, 35
Mrs. Roukema, 16, 17, 18, 19
Ms. Montoya, 6, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32
Ms. Woolsey, 19, 20, 21

ISBN 0-16-058684-4